3 0513 40023 3785

EM·OF·SUFFERING
LD·TESTAMENT

PROF. A. S. PEAKE, M.A.

Denver Seminary Washington DC Extension
c/o First Baptist Church of Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414

The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament.

BY

ARTHUR S. PEAKE, M.A.

Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester; Tutor in the Primitive Methodist College, and Lecturer in Lancashire Independent College; Sometime Fellow of Merton College, and Lecturer in Mansfield College, Oxford.

Dieu, c'est le mot de l'énigme du monde:
Jésus-Christ, c'est le mot de l'énigme de Dieu.
RAYMOND BRUCKER.

London:
EDWIN DALTON, 48, 49 AND 50 ALDERSGATE ST., E.C.
C. H. KELLY, 2 CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD, E.C.
1904.

HV
2318
P357

DEDICATED TO

My Friend and Teacher,

THE REV. A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT.,

PRINCIPAL OF MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD,

IN LOVE, REVERENCE, AND GRATITUDE.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/problemofsufferi0000arth_b0i6

PREFACE.

WHEN I accepted the invitation to deliver the Hartley Lecture, I selected The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament as my subject, for reasons that will be plain to all who read the last chapter of this book. I am only one of many, for whom the problem of pain constitutes the most powerful objection to a Theism, adequate to our deepest needs. I am well aware that to some I shall seem to drug my doubt with the anodyne of the Gospel. Yet I shall be more than content if by my witness-bearing I help some souls, to whom the world's misery is a nightmare, to escape beyond it into untroubled peace.

I am only too conscious how far the book is from what I had wished to make it. A serious operation, in November, 1902, has dislocated all my work, and the addition of new claims and duties to an already crowded life has made some of my plans impracticable. I had intended to give a full summary of the discussions in Germany and elsewhere, that for the last thirteen years have raged about the figure of the Servant of Yahweh; to compile a critical bibliography; to complete my commentary on Job; to deal much more thoroughly with the subjects treated in the last chapter. But half the book had to be written in a month, with College and Review work, Committees and Meetings, absorbing most of my time and strength. I trust, however, that I have said the essential things,

and though I might have read more, had leisure been granted me, I do not think the views I have formed would have undergone any substantial modification.

Perhaps I owe some explanation to my old pupils of the change in my views with reference to the Servant of Yahweh. I have never wavered in my belief that the Servant should be identified with Israel, and have not suffered myself to be fascinated by Duhm's powerful plea for an individual identification. But in common with several scholars, the view that the Servant is the historical Israel seemed to me exposed to fatal objections, so I gave my adhesion to the theory that the Servant is the ideal Israel, as it has been expounded, among others, especially by Professor Skinner in his valuable commentary on Isaiah 40—66 in the *Cambridge Bible.* But I was all the while acutely conscious of its difficulties, and held it only for want of a better. The most natural view seemed to be that the historical Israel was intended throughout, and I was fully prepared to move to this more consistent position, if the objections to it could be taken out of the way. It is to Giesebrecht above all that I owe the removal of these difficulties, though in this connexion I have also to mention Budde and Marti.

The critical problems of Habakkuk cost me a great deal of trouble, which led to an unexpected result. I have for several years hoped that a solution might be reached, if not in the form proposed by Budde, at any rate along his lines. But repeated study has driven me to the conclusion that neither Budde's solution, nor those of G. A. Smith, Peiser, or Betteridge are really tenable, and I had perforce to accept, with

Wellhausen and Nowack, the view first propounded by Giesebrecht. Not a little to my surprise I have also had to desert the usual view of the date, and place the prophecy in the exile. I much regret that the second part of Marti's commentary on the Minor Prophets has not yet been published, so that I have not been able to avail myself of his discussion of this and some other dark problems of the prophetic literature.

Many may be astonished that I should have thought it necessary to include a summary of the proofs that Isaiah 40—66 is not the work of the prophet Isaiah. I need hardly explain that this was due to no feeling that the question was any longer in dispute. But we need to remind ourselves how slowly the most certain results make their way, and I anticipate that I may have many readers to whom the tritest commonplaces of criticism will come with freshness. It is also striking that those who get hold of results, often get hold of them so imperfectly, so that we still hear people speaking of "two Isaiahs," unaware that if the book is not a unity, it must be highly complex in its structure. I have referred very little to literature earlier than 1892, when the publication of Duhm's Commentary on Isaiah opened a new era in the criticism and interpretation of the book.

I regret that it has been necessary to add so many footnotes. But for the most part they touch questions of textual criticism, and since the text seemed so often to need emendation, a detailed statement of reasons was necessary. Those who are alive to the difficulties of the received text will not, I believe, charge me with wanton criticism. While we ought

to be done with superstitious illusions as to the soundness of the Massoretic text, the textual critic always needs to be on his guard against subjectivity, arbitrariness and violence. And lest any one should imagine that emendations are put forward as anything more than tentative suggestions as to what the author may have written, it may be said explicitly that though in many cases it may be tolerably plain that the text is corrupt, it is only a few corrections that are fairly certain, while all degrees of probability, or plausibility, attach to the rest.

My debt to other scholars will be evident to those who are familiar with the subject. But I wish specially to acknowledge the kindness of two friends. My colleague, Professor Hope W. Hogg, Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature in the University of Manchester, has made time, amid a pressure of other work, that doubles my obligation, to read my proofs. He is in no way responsible for what I have written, but it has reassured me to have my work read by so competent and accurate a scholar. My friend, Miss Mabel Frith, has read my proofs and made suggestions which I have been glad to adopt. I have to thank her not only for this and for the keen interest she has taken in the book, but for the quotation from Raymond Brucker, that I have placed on the title page.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

MANCHESTER,
May 28th, 1904.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

The Rise of the Problem.

PAGE

The Ancient Hebrews saw in suffering a proof of Divine anger . 1
Josiah's Reformation meant that Judah was righteous, and so must be prosperous 2
This was contradicted by a series of tragedies culminating in the destruction of Jerusalem 3
Critical Questions in Habakkuk 4
Habakkuk's Problem: Why is Yahweh so indifferent to the suffering of the righteous, and the triumph of the godless oppressor? 5
The tyrant shall be overthrown for his violence and pride, while the righteous shall live by his faithfulness 7
Was Habakkuk too optimistic in his estimate of Judah? . . . 9
The misery of Judah no problem to Jeremiah 11
But God's dealings with him were a dark riddle 11
Driven to God, he found fellowship with Him becoming the essence of his religious life; an experience which created his doctrine of the New Covenant 13

CHAPTER II.

Ezekiel.

Even after the captivity of Jehoiachin, the Jews refused to believe that Jerusalem could fall 17
Results of disillusion 18
Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones, designed to lift the exiles from their despondency 19
The popular belief that the children were suffering for the sins of their fathers 21

PAGE

Ezekiel's temperament, and his conception of God . . . 22
He denies solidarity and vicarious punishment, and asserts individual responsibility 23
Though one-sided, his doctrine liberated men from the guilt of earlier generations or their own past, while it kept life at a high ethical pitch 24
The prophet becomes a pastor 26
Ezekiel's doctrine of personal responsibility not borrowed from Jeremiah's doctrine of personal religion, but elicited by criticism of God's righteousness 27
It is remarkable that with his individualism, Ezekiel should see in the destruction of Jerusalem and Judah a punishment for their whole past history of unfaithfulness 27
Nation and city have a life of their own, independent of the life of the units who compose the nation 29
Yahweh's all-sufficient motive an absorbing regard for His Holy Name 30
Ezekiel's doctrine very difficult for a Christian to appreciate, but the legalism he created saved the religion of Israel . . 32

CHAPTER III.

The Servant of Yahweh.

The rise of Cyrus 34
The Second Isaiah 35
The Restoration of Israel and of Zion 36
The universalism and particularism of the Second Isaiah . . 37
Israel's mission to the heathen 38
The four Servant Passages 39
Translation of the Servant Passages
I. Isaiah, 42^{1-4} 44
II. Isaiah, 49^{1-6} 45
III. Isaiah, 50^{4-9} 48
IV. Isaiah, 52^{13}-53^{12} 51
The Servant's proclamation of the true God to the Gentiles . 59
The meaning of the Servant's suffering and death . . . 61
Estimate of the Prophet's teaching about the Servant . . . 63

PAGE

The Prophet intended Israel and not Jesus of Nazareth by the Servant. But a nation was inadequate to the functions assigned to the Servant, which were completely realised by Jesus, Who concentrated in Himself the essential Israel . 65
The Twenty-second Psalm uttered by Israel, the Suffering Servant 66
The sufferer in the last extremities triumphs by faith . . . 71

CHAPTER IV.

A Century of Disillusion.

The disappointment and chilled enthusiasm of the returned exiles 73
Haggai and Zechariah 74
Bright hopes for Zerubbabel 74
The Satan urges the misery of the people as evidence of their guilt, but Yahweh rebukes him, and cleanses their representative from sin 75
Deep scepticism in the time of Malachi touching the moral government of the world; despondency of the pious . 78
Critical Problems of Isaiah 56-66 79
In spite of discouragement, these prophecies proclaim the future splendour of Zion 80

CHAPTER V.

The Problem in Job.

The poet concerned, not with the nation, but with the individual 83
Job smitten to justify the Satan's cynical estimate of his piety . 84
The conflict between Job's consciousness of integrity, and his belief in God's goodness 85
The friends sacrifice their friend to their theology, but do so as kindly as they can 87
Their platitudes fill him with scorn and anger, their unkindness wounds him to the quick 89
The main interest of the poem lies in Job's debate with God . 89
He accuses God of being his enemy 89
God's omnipotence makes His immorality the more terrible . 90
Job's own misery sharpens his insight into the misery of the world 91

PAGE

Yet it is God's treatment of himself that pre-occupies him . . 91

He feels that God, though He knows him to be innocent, is bent on putting him in the wrong, and all-wise and all-powerful will easily effect His purpose 92

He has no magnanimity, is a petty malevolent spy . . . 92

Job is certain of his own integrity 93

Yet while he accuses God of cruelty and meanness, the memory of God's former goodness causes him to turn to Him with remonstrance or pitiful appeal 93

He appeals from God his persecutor to God his vindicator . . 94

This schism in God reflects the schism in Job's experience . . 95

When God appears to answer Job He does not accept Job's conditions, but leaves him in torture and terrifies him with the whirlwind. He offers him no comfort or explanation, but overwhelms him with what seems brutal mockery . . 97

Yet His speeches are not irrelevant irony, but take the self-centred sufferer out of himself, and convict him of his limitations 97

The universe is a mighty organism, man only one of the many objects of God's concern 99

Job needs no explanation of his suffering, the vision of God assures him that all is well. He trusts God with every reason for distrusting Him, save his inward certainty of Him 100

Yet God placed Himself on His trial by His treatment of Job, the Epilogue was therefore necessary, not for Job's sake, but for God's 101

The lessons of the Book: (*a*) We must face resolutely the facts of life; (*b*) suffering does not pre-suppose sin; (*c*) suffering may test the reality of piety; (*d*) man is not the sole object of God's regard; (*e*) man cannot from his limited knowledge judge God's government of the universe; (*f*) the chief lesson is that no speculative solution is possible, but peace may be attained through our knowledge of God; (*g*) the poet probably meant to suggest that a life after death might be possible 102

The poem while later than the Servant poems makes no use of the thought of vicarious suffering, since it is concerned with the individual, not with Israel 103

CHAPTER VI.

Songs in the Night.

PAGE

Numerous references in the Psalms to suffering, and appeals to God for deliverance 104

Various causes assigned: the sin of ancestors; the anger of God for some unknown reason; the indifference of God; the hostility of the Elohim 105

Three Psalms deal specifically with our problem: Psalms 37, 49, 73 107

Psalm 37 counsels patience, and announces the destruction of the wicked, and the prosperity of the righteous. It does not advance the solution 107

Psalm 49 solves the problem by appealing to the difference in the fate of the wicked and the righteous after death . . . 108

Psalm 73 shows the writer baffled by the prosperity of the wicked, and asserting the service of God to be vain, till he was initiated into God's holy secrets, and discovered the destiny of the godless after death. How different his own lot! In the consciousness of unbroken fellowship with God, he knows that Death itself cannot separate him from His love . . 110

Translation of the seventy-third Psalm 112

This Psalm the deepest expression of the religious consciousness that we find in the Old Testament 117

CHAPTER VII.

The Apocalyptist and the Pessimist.

The sorrows of the present sent many for comfort to the future, and thus created apocalyptic 118

General features of apocalyptic 119

Joel from Judah's terrible suffering infers its sinfulness . . 120

The apocalypse, Isaiah 24-27, of interest for its reference to the punishment of the angelic guardians of the nations; to the annihilation of Death; and to a resurrection of pious Israelites to re-people the depleted land 121

Daniel interesting for our problem in attributing the miseries of earth to the angelic powers, and in its prediction of the resurrection of the martyrs to honour, and of the apostates to abhorrence 123

PAGE

Ecclesiastes, when relieved of interpolations designed to break the point of the author's words, presents in the main a consistent view of life. This is that life is meaningless, a closed circle, and that progress is impossible 125

Man cannot identify himself with the main stream of things, for though God has implanted the instinct for this, He has deliberately withheld knowledge of the law of events . 127

This conclusion that life is an unsatisfying mockery has been reached by exhaustive experiment. Wisdom and pleasure alike brought disenchantment 129

Observation discloses the universal reign of misery . . . 129

The author remains a Theist, but his Theism has lost its religious value 131

While life is bad, man does well to make the best of it, and palliate its wretchedness by a moderate enjoyment of such pleasures as it offers, especially since old age is coming, when the zest for pleasure will be gone, and in Sheol no pleasure will be possible any more 132

Ecclesiastes is the negation of all that makes the Gospel dear. It is therefore of great value, since it puts with tremendous force the logic of a non-Christian position, and shows us how necessary was God's revelation in Christ . . . 134

CHAPTER VIII.

Solution or Escape?

Pain a more baffling mystery than sin or death. For sin is largely accounted for by man's freedom, and the animal ancestry from which he has emerged 137

And death is rather a boon than an evil, tragic in its circumstances and not in itself 138

Suffering serves valuable ends, yet these do not meet the appalling difficulties of our problem 140

The Old Testament yields many helpful suggestions, but they are too crude, too insecure, too dubious 143

Most valuable is its inner certainty of God, by which rare spirits escaped the problem 144

PAGE

All that the Old Testament said gets a much deeper significance in Christianity, especially the thought of vicarious suffering, and the conviction of immortality 145
Yet suffering will always be a largely unsolved mystery . . 146
We need an assurance of God's love that will triumph over the facts which deny it 147
This comes with the doctrine that God is love, made possible by God's existence as a Trinity, and proved by God's sacrifice of His Son. The Incarnation replaces hearsay knowledge by the vision of God 147
But this rests on the truth of Christianity. If we surrender the divinity of Christ it is hard to retain a faith in God's goodness. We are saved from pessimism by the Cross of Christ . . 148
Jesus also helps us by His unshaken faith in God in face of the world's misery, and His own unparalleled agony . . . 148
The Cross is either the key to the riddle of the universe, or it darkens its mystery 149
If we believe in Jesus, then we may dare to believe in God, and enter into His perfect peace, content not to know the answer, but sure of His love 149

Appendix A. Recent Criticism of Habakkuk 150
Appendix B. Critical Problems of Isaiah 40-66 . . . 172
Appendix C. The Servant of Yahweh 180

THE PROBLEM OF SUFFERING.

CHAPTER I.

The Rise of the Problem.

IT was not till a comparatively late period in the history of Israel that the problem of suffering engaged the attention of her thinkers. The ancient Hebrews, like kindred peoples, looked on their disasters as a token of the Divine anger. This anger might be kindled by national sin, or it might be the mysterious expression of a fitful mood. The latter view could not, of course, be seriously entertained alongside of a worthier conception of God, so we find the Biblical writers for the most part tracing the wrath of God to the disobedience of His people. The historians tell us how the Israelites forsook Yahweh and were sold to other nations, till they returned to their God, and He gave them their desire upon their enemies. To this conviction of the close connexion between sin and suffering, the prophets again and again appealed. Thus Isaiah speaking to his countrymen, when Judah had been

scourged by Sennacherib, till from head to foot it was one festering sore, chides the infatuation which blinds them to the truth and sternly utters Yahweh's ultimatum : "Come now, and let us reason together, saith Yahweh : if your sins are as scarlet, shall they be as white as snow ? if they be red like crimson, shall they be as wool ? If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land : but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword : for the mouth of Yahweh hath spoken it."

Under Manasseh, religion and morality went from bad to worse. The prophetic party was bitterly persecuted, old abuses were revived, and strange forms of worship were introduced. His reign seemed to a later generation the adequate cause for the misery soon to fall on Judah. With the accession of Josiah in 639 B.C. new hope dawned for the higher religion of Israel. The prophets, who had been driven to work underground, now found the times propitious, and laboured with such success that when in 621 B.C. the Deuteronomic Law was discovered, the seed fell on a soil not wholly uncongenial. Terror-struck at its threats against disobedience, Josiah carried through a drastic reformation. Since the Law had set before the people a blessing or a curse, conditional on obedience or disobedience to its commands, the prompt and whole-hearted execution of the reforms it demanded, seemed to promise that the nation's long warfare had drawn to its close. Judah was at last a righteous people, then it must be pros-

perous, for law and prophets had combined to declare that it should be well with the righteous.

But this bright illusion was soon shattered by a series of disasters. Josiah, unwilling to exchange his almost unfettered freedom, under the suzerainty of a decadent Assyria, for servitude to Pharaoh-necoh, the Egyptian king, fought the latter at Megiddo[1] and was killed on the field (608 B.C.) And now the unhappy country sank more and more deeply in misfortune. Jehoahaz was deposed after a three months' reign and taken to die as a captive in Egypt. He was succeeded by his elder brother Jehoiakim. The Assyrian empire fell about 607 B.C., and in 605 B.C., Babylon conquered Egypt at Carchemish, and entered on the period of its supremacy. Jehoiakim became the vassal of Nebuchadnezzar, and some years later rebelled.[2] He died before punishment fell on Judah, and it was reserved for his son Jehoiachin to be carried captive to Babylon with the flower of the nation in 597 B.C. Nebuchadnezzar placed a brother of Jehoiakim on the throne, and gave him the name Zedekiah. The new monarch was weak rather than ill-disposed, and he is less to be blamed for the reckless violation of his solemn oath

[1] So the present Hebrew text. Possibly it was further South, in Josiah's own territory. Herodotus (ii. 159) speaks of a defeat of the Syrians at Magdolos. If he is referring to the same event, the name meant would be Migdal, perhaps the Migdal-gad mentioned Josh. 15^{37}. (See H. P. Smith's *Old Testament History*, pp. 279, 280).

[2] The chronology is difficult. The "three years" of our present Hebrew text (2 Kings 24^{1}) seems too short.

of loyalty than those who forced his hand. Untaught by experience and in defiance of Jeremiah's warning, the turbulent nation, trusting, such was its madness, in the promises of Egypt, threw off the Babylonian yoke. This time there was no reprieve, and the blow already steadfastly foretold by Jeremiah for more than thirty years, fell in 586 B.C. Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed, and the nation went into exile in Babylon.

It is generally believed that, before the last act of this tragedy was played, a voice had already been raised in pain and perplexity. Unhappily the critical and historical difficulties of the book of Habakkuk are so serious that we cannot be at all sure what the conditions were that created his problem. Numerous solutions have been proposed, each of them with its own attractions, each exposed to grave objections.[3] The following conclusions seem to the present writer to be probable. (*a*) The subject of the complaint in 1^{2-4} is the same as in 1^{12-17}, in both passages the problem rises from the oppression of righteous Judah by a heathen tyrant. (*b*) Since in these two passages the rule of the tyrant has been long established, 1^{5-11} cannot spring out of the same situation, unless in $1^{2-4, 12-17}$ another heathen power than the Chaldeans is intended. (*c*) Every form of the theory that the Chaldeans are raised up as instruments of judgment on another heathen power, is beset by difficulties of too serious a

[3] See Appendix A: "Recent Criticism of the Book of Habakkuk."

character to permit us to accept it. (*d*) The only alternative that remains is to regard 1^{5-11} as an older oracle, which is out of place in the present prophecy. (*e*) After 1^{5-11} has been eliminated, substantially the whole of the first two chapters is the composition of Habakkuk, and probably dates from the exile. If, however, the usual view that the prophet wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem be correct, more of 2^{9-20} might plausibly be assigned to a later writer. (*f*) The third chapter is a post-exilic Psalm, which owes its present position to the title it bore in the collection of Psalms from which it was taken.

Although I prefer to regard the prophecy as exilic, yet in deference to the general opinion of scholars, I will speak of it at this point. It makes comparatively little difference to our estimate. If Habakkuk saw his vision in the gloomy period before the fall of Jerusalem, his problem arises because he feels so keenly the strange contrast between the fair promise of the happiness that should follow on reform, and the dark fulfilment now that reform has come. If it was during the exile, then the destruction of the Jewish State and the captivity are responsible for much of the prophet's perplexity, and the Reformation falls into the background. But though in view of the uncertainties we cannot state problem or solution with precision, yet they may be stated with sufficient accuracy for our purpose. Speaking generally, his problem rises out of the oppression of the righteous, and the prosperity of the violent

oppressor, while the answer he receives is that retribution is certainly coming, and the righteous shall live by his firm fidelity to Yahweh. He begins with a complaint of Yahweh's apparent indifference. Strange that he should cry and find Yahweh deaf so long! for if he feels it intolerable to look on these scenes of outrage, how can Yahweh endure them, whose eyes are too pure to behold evil? Yet the treacherous nation still pursues its course of immoral conquest. Like a fisherman, skilled in his craft, the tyrant sweeps the nations into his net,[4] and annexes them to his bloated empire. In 2^{5-20} other traits are added to the portrait, his insatiable greed, his vain ambition to lift himself beyond the reach of evil,[5] his savage gloating over the shame and agony of his victims. Is then his career of evil to go on unchecked, "shall he not spare to slay the nations continually?"

As he broods over his problem, the prophetic ecstasy begins to fall upon him. In spirit he climbs the watch-tower,[6] whence he may search the secrets of heaven, and see the forces that shape the destinies of earth. The response he wins from God seems at first to be meagre, and the answer one that might have been divined from the facts already before him. He is bidden wait in confidence for the fulfilment of the vision, which will surely come in spite of delay.

[4] For Budde's inference from the angling metaphor see Appendix A.

[5] This reminds us of the story of the tower of Babel (Gen. 11^{1-9}).

[6] Cf. Isa. 21^{6-9}.

The soul of the oppressor is puffed up, it is not upright in him, but the just shall live by his faithfulness. If the heathen tyrant was what he had been described to be, and if God Who ruled the universe was of too pure eyes to behold evil, the collision of these facts could have but one issue. In a world ruled by such a God, the triumph of wickedness was an anomaly, and anomalies cannot be permanent in the moral order. It was not merely that the conqueror's cruelty and violence filled the prophet's soul with indignation, but his pride was ominous of ruin. In his denunciation of the former, the prophet stands in the succession of Amos, who uttered Yahweh's sentence on the heathen for outrages on our common humanity, and of Nahum with his passionate execration of Nineveh and exultation over her downfall. The feeling that pride went before destruction was widespread in antiquity. Men, to whom the jealousy of the gods was a real and ever present peril, were not tempted to flaunt their happiness in the face of heaven. To walk softly and humbly was their safety; pride was an uncanny temper, that would soon draw the lightning from the clouds. The thought that because Yahweh is high and lifted up, there is to be a Day of Yahweh, when all that is high and lifted up on earth shall be abased, is very prominent in Isaiah. But he has transformed the vindictive jealousy of the gods into a lofty doctrine in harmony with his conception of Yahweh not simply as

the exalted, but as the holy God. Habakkuk stands in the line of this thought and finds in the pride of the oppressor the presage of his downfall. He deifies his own strength and skill as the givers of success, just as Assyria had done according to Isaiah (10^{5-15}). The latter prophet had spoken of Assyria as the rod of Yahweh's anger, with which He smote the nations, but which, when it had served its purpose, would be snapped asunder for its insolence, and cast away. This combination does not occur in Habakkuk, if we are right in rejecting the common, but very difficult view that the Chaldeans were raised up to be the instruments of Yahweh's vengeance on the sinners of Judah, and were then for their arrogance to be destroyed.

The prophet's mind is fixed on the certainty of the tyrant's overthrow, even though delay may seem to justify despair. Retribution lay in the nature of things. His empire was based on brutality, so he should perish in the blood that he had spilt. His exploits filled him with an impious arrogance, so Heaven must crush him and vindicate its outraged majesty. In the methods of swelling his empire, and the temper with which success inspired him, lurked the secret of his ruin. All this is a very impressive moral lesson, that does not quickly grow out of date, but it adds nothing essentially new. The prosperity of the wicked is not explained, we are simply told that it cannot last.

Similarly, no explanation is given of the suffer-

ings of the righteous, although the prophet demands one, and expects to receive it on his watch-tower. What is given him is an assurance that they will soon be ended, and that by his fidelity the righteous shall save his life. The righteous one is Judah.[7] It is true that in this estimate of the nation's character the prophet is sharply divided from his predecessors. This is usually explained by the fact that in the meantime the Deuteronomic Reformation had taken place. Still, on any theory, which places the prophecy before the fall of Jerusalem, there is difficulty. If it is the Chaldean oppression which vexes the prophet's soul, that did not begin till the reign of Jehoiakim had lasted for some years, and under that worthless monarch the Reformation had been undone, so that Judah could seem righteous only to a very optimistic gaze. If Budde is right in identifying the oppressor with Assyria, and fixing the date about 615 B.C., then it is true that Josiah was on the throne and the Reformation policy was still in force. Judah was

[7] The singular suggests to a modern reader that the individual is intended, every righteous one shall live by his fidelity, all the more so as the use of the passage in Hebrews, and especially in Paul's famous watchword, so far removed from the thought of the prophet, "But he that is righteous by faith shall live" (*i.e.*, he shall live who is justified by faith), concentrates attention on the individual. It is, of course, possible that the reference here is individual. But it is not likely. The singular in the former part of the verse refers to the oppressing nation, and so in 1^{10-17}, 2^{5-20}. This makes it probable that the just is righteous Judah. On Peiser's view of the prophecy, it would apparently be the prophet himself.

a righteous people, externally, at any rate; but its condition was prosperous. Assyria was decrepit, its rule altogether relaxed; why should the prophet complain of its career of unchecked conquest, or why cry out so bitterly of his country's suffering? The difficulty presents itself in this way. Habakkuk's problem is the prosperity of the wicked and the suffering of the righteous nation; but, in his time, on the usual view of his date, when the nation was righteous, it was for the most part prosperous, and during its period of wickedness its fortunes went from bad to worse.

Moreover, the question might be raised, whether at any point in this period, even the best, Judah could be described as really righteous. Jeremiah's judgment seems to have been throughout unfavourable. The Reformation had not gone below the surface, there had been no essential change in the situation, from Jeremiah's point of view the problem why righteous Judah suffered did not exist. Now if they were contemporaries, we cannot deny that Jeremiah saw more deeply than Habakkuk, and was not betrayed by glittering illusions into unconsciousness of the rottenness at the nation's heart. But this need not blind us to the merits of Habakkuk. There was room for the recognition of a relative righteousness in Judah, as contrasted with the sin of the heathen, and in this he does not stand alone. Nahum is distinguished from his predecessors by his omission of all reference to the sin of his country,

and by the concentration of his wrath on Assyria. And especially of the Second Isaiah, is it true that while he insists on its sin, he yet regards Israel as righteous in comparison with the heathen. The difficulty is materially lightened if we place Habakkuk in the exile. In any case he is not the mere victim of a false optimism in his estimate of Judah; there was a problem, though all he could do in face of it was to counsel patience, and no hint of a solution was revealed to him.

While Jeremiah felt upon him no pressure of mystery in the sad fate of Judah, lacerated though he was in his tenderest feelings by it, yet his own lot may well have led him to ponder on the dark riddle of God's ways. For more than thirty years he watched his country move blindly to its doom, incredulous of his warnings and intolerant of his appeals. Secure in the possession of the Temple, and resting on Isaiah's once splendidly vindicated, but now antiquated, doctrine of the indestructibility of Zion, the Jews mocked the message of their Cassandra, and shot the rapids into unlooked-for ruin. Through all this period the lot of this greatest of the prophets was harder than we can well imagine. Filled with a passionate love for his country, how could he be other than broken-hearted, as he sat long years by the death-bed of his nation, well knowing that there was no longer room for hope? "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved.

. . . . Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people." But there was not wanting to the bitterness of his trouble the conviction that all its woes were the fruit of its own ill-doing. And now to the anguish for his people's suffering, and the deeper anguish for its sin, there was added that which sprang from the tragedy of his own career. He was forced, in loyalty to his vocation, to set himself against the cherished illusions of his countrymen, in vain attempt to stem the torrent, which bore them like a mill race to their doom. He denounces their sins, idolatry, violence, oppression, fraud, theft, and murder, their trust in the temple of Yahweh as a fetish assuring their safety, unmindful of the fate that had blotted out Shiloh, their schemes of rebellion, their desperate warfare against inexorable facts. He bids the exiles in Babylon reconcile themselves to captivity, he warns the remmant in Jerusalem to submit while there is yet time. Thus in spite of his pure and lofty patriotism he seemed a faint-hearted traitor, who stole the people's courage by his gloomy forebodings. Again and again he risked death at the hands of his infuriated countrymen. Had he been of that temperament which seeks its joy in conflict and rebukes transgression with a stern delight, he had been a happier man. But sensitive and high-strung, with unplumbed depths of tenderness and yearning affection, his life of contention

was an intolerable burden. He pines for a lodge in the wilderness away from the strife of tongues, away from the treachery and deceit that have poisoned all the relations of life. He curses the day of his birth to see labour and sorrow. He laments that his pain is perpetual and his wound refuses to be healed. He has become a laughing-stock to the people, and his message meets always with derision. Terror is all about him, dark and sinister schemes are plotted for his destruction. Fain would he yield to the forces which would drive him from his post, fain abandon the unequal struggle into which he has suffered Yahweh to entice him. Yet Yahweh will not let him escape, but bends His reluctant servant to His will by the intolerable compulsion of His word. "And if I say, I will not make mention of Him, nor speak any more in His name, then there is in mine heart as it were a burning fire shut up in my bones and I am weary with forbearing, and I cannot *contain*." A lonely man, forbidden the sweet solace of wife and children, mocked and misunderstood by those whom he longed to save, when the sharp agony broke down his self-restraint and forced him out of himself, to whom could he turn for sympathy but to God? In a strange tumult his soul goes out to God, mingling bitter reproach for the pain and scorn He has made him suffer, with prayers for vengeance on his enemies, exultation at God's presence with him, and gladness in the fellowship which he enjoys with God. Yet his pleadings do not make God swerve

from His purpose. He gains the assurance that his enemies shall not prevail against him. But even before his birth Yahweh had chosen him to fulfil His great design. Therefore he cannot receive discharge from his warfare. Nay, he may look to a yet severer conflict. When he pleads the inconsistency between the righteousness of God and the prosperity of the wicked, the baffled prophet receives the reply, "If thou hast run with the footmen and they have wearied thee, then how canst thou contend with horses? and if in a land of peace thou fleest, how wilt thou do in the pride of Jordan?"[8] It was then, with no light on his suffering, save that it was incident to the work God had appointed for him, that Jeremiah had to set his face like a flint and go wearily forward with a task more bitter than death.

It lies beyond my scope to discuss the function of suffering as a medium of revelation. Yet at this point I may be permitted so far to transgress my limits, as to indicate the part it played in transforming the conception of religion. It was this life of unceasing sorrow, this isolation and misunderstanding, that forced the prophet from man to God. To Him he lays bare his troubles, refers his tangled perplexities, utters his keen reproaches or exulting confidence. Beyond other men he is driven into intimate fellowship with God, till it becomes a necessity of his

[8] Duhm regards 12^{1-5} as the work of a later writer. I read *bōreach* for *bōteach* with Hitzig, Cornill, and Duhm.

religious life. Thus he came to understand religion as a personal relation between himself and God; thus the individual, not the State, became the religious unit. Hence while his greatest doctrine, that of the New Covenant, still speaks of a covenant made with the nation, yet its fulfilment on Israel's part is guaranteed by the fact that God puts His law in their inward parts, and writes it on their heart, so that for himself each individual knows Him.[9] It was ample reward for all his sufferings to have this great experience and to enshrine it in a doctrine in which Christ and the Apostles recognised a fit expression of Christianity.[10]

[9] In the first edition of his *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte* (1893) Smend argued strongly that the New Covenant passage (Jer. 31^{31-34}) originated in the post-exilic period (pp. 239—241). His argument rested largely on his conclusion that Jer. 30, 31 reflected the conditions of the post-exilic period. I think that his arguments carry conviction for considerable sections of these two chapters. But I do not think that the recognition of a large post-exilic element in them requires us to pass this judgment on the prediction of a New Covenant. I had independently reached this view of Smend's arguments a good while before I found that Giesebrecht adopts the same position in his commentary on Jeremiah. I am not convinced that the prophecy of a New Covenant pre-supposes, as Smend argues, that the Old Covenant had been already abrogated by the destruction of Jerusalem. For many years before it happened, that catastrophe had been a prophetic certainty to Jeremiah; is it incredible that he had meditated on the future relations of Yahweh and Israel? And if the Old Covenant had failed, what more likely than that he should anticipate a New Covenant? The form which this should take was naturally determined largely by his own religious ideal. This, as we see from other passages, was inward rather than external, and his experience had driven him to seek his own religious satisfaction in personal fellowship with God. This, in spite

of Smend's denial, is, I think, the essential meaning of the passage. I believe the doctrine of the New Covenant to be Jeremiah's, on the ground of its harmony with his teaching, of the fact that he elsewhere expresses the same thought, though less definitely, of the possibility of explaining it out of his personal experience, and its remarkable relevance to the historical situation. I may add that Marti, in his *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion* (1897, p. 120), maintained the authenticity of the passage, similarly Cheyne in his *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile* (1898, p. 253). In the second edition of the work already mentioned (1899) Smend reaffirms his position, and says that he has not been convinced by Giesebrecht's arguments. In his article *Covenant*, in the Encyclopædia Biblica, Prof. Schmidt, of Cornell, treats the passage as post-exilic, and repeats this view in his very radical article on *Jeremiah*. Duhm adopts the same position in his recent commentary on Jeremiah (1901). This is the most significant fact on that side of the controversy. It is true that Duhm's treatment of the book is radical, but Duhm the critic is not the measure of Duhm the interpreter of ideas, and least of all in this case. He has a genuine enthusiasm for Jeremiah, and it is with much reluctance that he has felt himself unable to escape the force of Smend's arguments. Perhaps we might see in this a Nemesis on his general critical theory of the book.

[10] 1 Cor. 11^{25}, cf. Mark 14^{24}, Matt. 26^{28}; 2 Cor. 3^{6}. The passage underlies much of the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

CHAPTER II.

Ezekiel.

THE problem of suffering did not become acute till Jerusalem had fallen. Even after Jehoiachin and the best of the nation had gone into captivity in 597 B.C., the buoyant optimism of the people still scorned the solid ground of facts. The prophets fed their fantastic hopes with brilliant predictions, the offspring of a dogma estranged from ethics and out of touch with reality. In two years, so Hananiah prophesied early in Zedekiah's reign, the yoke of Babylon should be broken, and the vessels of the Lord's house, the king and the captives should return to Jerusalem (Jer. 28). In Babylon also the prophets fervently proclaimed the speedy end of the exile and denounced Jeremiah for his warning that the captivity would be long (Jer. 29). Many in Jerusalem, indeed, entertained the strange delusion that they were far better than those who had gone to Babylon, and that while the exiles were abandoned of God, the fact that they were spared was a guarantee of

Yahweh's favour. But apart from some, who despairing of Yahweh, had resorted to primitive superstitions, or other forms of idolatry (Ezek. 8), one and all, in Jerusalem and in Babylon, despising the admonitions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, held firmly to the conviction that Jerusalem could not be destroyed.

When these glittering bubbles broke against the brutal realities of a city in flames and a nation in captivity, the problem of suffering became the burning question for the people. It was solved in various ways. Many held that the cause of their trouble was to be found in the weakness or indifference of Yahweh, and some had yielded to this feeling even before the fall of the city (Ezek. 8^{12}, 9^{9}). It was only to be expected that a people which spurned the teaching of Jeremiah, and had not absorbed the spiritual side of prophetic doctrine, should readily see in the national disasters the defeat of the nation's God. Or they said that Yahweh had forgotten them, or that He had forsaken His land. Some even went so far as to ascribe their misfortunes to their exclusive worship of Yahweh. In the very instructive narrative in Jer. 44, we read that the fugitives in Egypt met Jeremiah's rebuke of their idolatry and prophecy of extermination with a resolute refusal to abandon their ways. Rather they would continue to burn incense to the Queen of Heaven, for while they still served her they had lived in abundance and seen

no evil. But since they had ceased to serve her, they tell the prophet, "we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and the famine." There was, indeed, much plausibility in their argument. With Josiah's Reformation there had not come the permanent good fortune that had been anticipated. Less than quarter of a century had seen the death of Josiah, the Egyptian and then the Chaldean oppression with the first captivity. In eleven years more temple and city were a smoking ruin. And now the unhappy remnant, left behind in Judah, had fled to Egypt, dreading the vengeance of Nebuchadnezzar for Ishmael's treacherous murder of Gedaliah, the governor. From their standpoint something was to be said for the belief that the source of their misery was unfaithfulness to the Queen of Heaven. No doubt, they were typical of many more in Babylon. They have no significance for later history, since they would quickly lose their racial identity and be merged with the heathen among whom they dwelt. The religious future lay with those who held fast to Yahweh.

The temper of these was one of deep discouragement, mingled with resentment against their God. Their despair found expression in the popular saying, "Our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost; we are clean cut off" (Ezek. 37^{11}). To uproot this settled conviction of the nation's extinction, Ezekiel narrates his wonderful vision

of the valley of dry bones. In the spirit he is taken to Jerusalem, and there he sees the valley filled with a vast number of bones. And as he is led to walk tenderly about them, not crushing them with his feet, he scans them more closely and sees that they are very dry. The flesh has rotted away or birds and beasts have picked the skeletons clean, and then the skeletons have fallen to pieces, and all that is left is a mass of isolated bones. And these have lost all sap of vitality, so that had it not been Yahweh Who put it, the question "Son of man, can these dry bones live?" would have seemed a mere mockery. The prophet can only answer reverently, "O Lord Yahweh, Thou knowest." Then he is bidden prophesy over the bones. The prophetic word has within it an inherent energy, which works on to its own fulfilment (Isa. 55^{11}). So, as he prophesies over them, bone seeks its mate till skeletons are complete, then these are clothed with sinews, flesh, and skin. Still they are only dead bodies, so the prophet has once more to prophesy for the breath to come from the four winds and breathe into the dead that they may live. And as this is accomplished they stand on their feet an exceeding great army.

This vision seems at first to bear only indirectly on our subject. But it shows in a very striking way how profound was the hopelessness of the people. The nation was as dead as the dry bones that Ezekiel saw bleaching in the valley. Moreover, this

metaphor of death, in the sense of national dissolution, will meet us again in a very important connexion. It is true, however, that Ezekiel's message that Yahweh will cause the people to come up out of their graves, has little relevance to the problem of Israel's suffering.

But mingled with the people's despondency was a feeling of resentment against their God; and this is important alike for the view of the Israelites and of Ezekiel. It found expression in the proverb which Jeremiah and Ezekiel tell us was current among their contemporaries: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (Jer. 31^{29}; Ezek. 18^{2}).

This was a very natural explanation of their misfortunes. It rested on the ancient belief in solidarity, which went back to a very primitive social condition, but which was now provoking ethical criticism. That the sins of the fathers were visited on the children to the third and fourth generation was a principle expressed in the Decalogue. We must not forget, of course, that this solidarity did not work for evil only. While penalty passes on to the third and fourth generation, mercy is shown to thousands who belong to those who love God. This feeling of unity in the life of a people through all the stages of its history, this sense of mutual responsibility and the punishment of one generation for the sins of its predecessors, was deeply wrought into the consciousness of

Israel. And the principle of retribution, expressed in the proverb about the sour grapes, is definitely applied by the author of the Book of Kings to the exile of Judah. Several times he asserts that this and the other misfortunes of Judah were due to the sin of Manasseh (2 Kings 21^{11-15}; $23^{26,27}$; $24^{3,4}$). The same thought is found also in Jer. 15^{4}. The Jews in exile did not deny the principle, they firmly believed it to be the explanation of their own sufferings but they complained that it outraged their sense of justice. God was not treating them fairly; Manasseh sinned and they had to suffer: "The ways of Yahweh are not equal." A large section of Ezekiel's teaching was called forth as a protest against this accusation.

This prophet, who had gone into exile with Jehoiachin in 597 B.C., held a position of high responsibility. When Jerusalem fell in 586, Jeremiah's life work was all but done. But Ezekiel whose call came to him in 592, had the task laid upon him, not simply of delivering the message of judgment before the final stroke fell on the "rebellious house," but of confronting the new conditions and preparing for the restoration. His prophetic career was controlled by the fundamental conception of the glory of Yahweh, which had been stamped into his soul by the vision which made him a prophet. We might almost call him the Calvin of the Old Testament. His temperament was very different from Jeremiah's. He lacked his tenderness, his

sympathy, his deep love, his passionate longing to be loved; he stood in the succession of Amos, and Isaiah, and Micah, rather than in the succession of Hosea and Jeremiah. His severity made the word of judgment congenial to him, while Jeremiah's keen denunciations, like Hosea's, quiver with his pain. Nor is there any trace in his relations with God of that intimate communion, which is so characteristic of Jeremiah. He falls prostrate before the blinding brightness of His glory, and knows himself to be but a frail child of man in contrast with the all-powerful and all-holy God. As he gazes upon Him, he is crushed, like Isaiah, by the sense of his own unworthiness, and realises the hideous uncleanness of his people. He thinks of Yahweh as seeking in all things His own glory, keenly resenting all encroachment on His honour and jealously guarding His holy Name from all that would profane it. His own problem is therefore not to reconcile with justice the hard fate of Israel, but to clear the fair fame of Yahweh from the aspersions cast upon it. If he seeks to justify the ways of God to man, it is rather that God may be vindicated, than that man's heart may be at peace. He never felt the pressure of the mystery of suffering; where Yahweh governed, to recognise a problem was to challenge the equity of His rule. Nevertheless the problem existed for others, if not for himself, and so it came about that he had to discuss it.

With remarkable courage he repudiates the earlier

conception of solidarity. It is wholly untrue to say that the Jews are suffering for the sins of their fathers. There is no such thing as vicarious punishment, or vicarious reward. The father cannot suffer for the sin of the son, nor the son for the sin of his father. It is not true that the soul that sins shall escape, and another perish in his stead. The soul that sins, it and no other shall die. "The righteousness of the righteous shall be put down to his own account, and the wickedness of the wicked to his own account" (18^{20}). The misfortunes of the people were therefore not, as they, in agreement with their own historian, urged, a penalty for the sins of Manasseh, but the just reward of their own.

This doctrine of individual responsibility created a revolution in religious thought and life. It is easy to criticise it, and show that the doctrine of solidarity expressed a truth deeply rooted in experience. The old saying is true that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children. We are members one of another, no man lives to himself, our character and conduct alike are largely determined, for good or ill, by forces in whose release we had no share. It is not by denying patent facts that we shall vindicate the order under which we live. Yet Ezekiel's doctrine of individual responsibility is not on that account to be brushed aside as illegitimate. Not only does it express a great truth, but a truth that needed just then to be asserted, even in an exaggerated form. To the man, who bore on his conscience the load of

a guilt not his own, the prophet spoke a liberating word: a man has to answer only for sins he has himself committed. To those, who thought that the righteousness of the fathers availed to make good deficiencies of their own, the stern law is proclaimed that none can be saved by the good deeds of another, even of the best. There is no transfer of merit, there is, indeed, no superfluous merit to be transferred. "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord Yahweh" (14^{14}). But the prophet carries the thought a stage further. In the exercise of his freedom a man may change his whole course of life, the wicked may turn from his wickedness, or the righteous from his righteousness. Habit does not bind him in shackles that he cannot burst. And just as the sin or goodness of others does not involve him in any consequences, so little does the sin or goodness of his own past life. The prophet looks forward to the great impending judgment, which is to fall on Israel. When this takes place, the righteous will survive and the wicked be slain. The fate of each individual is determined by the accident of his condition at the moment when judgment is executed. If he has a long past of sin behind him, but has repented of his wickedness, then he shall be spared, and all his former evil life shall not be remembered against him. If on the other hand he has lived for many years in righteousness, but has been betrayed into

sin, and he is in a state of sin when judgment comes, then all his long career of goodness counts for nothing in his favour, but he shall die in his sin. Thus judgment selects its victims, not in virtue of the general drift of a man's life, not in accordance with his intrinsic character, or by balancing his good against his evil deeds, but on what seems the merely arbitrary principle that all may be determined by the sheer accident of time. If judgment came a day sooner or a day later, in how many cases fate would be reversed. Yet even for this there is a relative justification. With what encouragement comes the message to the man who is fettered by habit and crushed by accumulated sins, if a voice bids him snap his chain, since he has the power, and assures him that, if he repent, not all the transgressions of a lifetime will affect his standing with God. And, once more, how salutary the warning that no man must presume on his past, so far as to be slack in his efforts, or judge that his many righteous deeds can secure him, if he lapses into sin. Thus hope comes to the despairing sinner, while the righteous is warned to relax none of his vigilance. Any moment may be the moment of destiny, life must always be strung to the highest ethical pitch. Since life and death thus hung in the balance, and this act or that might embody the fateful choice, the prophet's mission is no longer simply to the nation, but to the individual. He is responsible for uttering the warning to the righteous that he abide in his right-

eousness, lest he be cut off in his sin, and to the wicked that he turn from his evil way and live. He becomes a pastor, who is bound to watch for souls as one that must give account. If, when the catastrophe comes, any man be found in sin, whom the prophet had failed to warn, he must die, but God will require his blood at the prophet's hand.

It would probably be a mistake to suppose that Ezekiel learnt his individualism from Jeremiah. It is by no means certain that Jeremiah had formulated his doctrine so early. There is also a wide difference between the two doctrines. The emphasis with Jeremiah is on personal religion, with Ezekiel on personal responsibility. It was rather due to the criticism passed on God's action that Ezekiel proclaimed so uncompromising a doctrine. Once he had said one generation cannot suffer for the sin of another, it was only a step further to say that one individual cannot suffer for the sin of another.

With all this emphasis on the correspondence between the fate of the individual and the condition in which he happens to be at the moment when the storm of judgment breaks, it is remarkable to find Ezekiel so much concerned with the past. If the children's teeth are set on edge because they have themselves eaten sour grapes, if they suffer for their own sins and not for the sins of their fathers, why does the prophet dilate at such length on the sin of the chosen people through all its history? While

other prophets had spoken of the early purity of Israel when Yahweh rescued her from bondage, wooed her in the wilderness and won her for His bride, Ezekiel sees nothing in all the stages of her career but a series of gross acts of infidelity. With a naked realism that strikes strangely on our finer taste, he pictures her loathsome and insatiable passion (chaps. 16 and 23). All the kindness of Yahweh had been wasted upon her. She had been idolatrous in Egypt, and He was minded to cut her off, but in tender regard for His holy Name, that it might not be profaned in the sight of the heathen, He spared her and brought her into the wilderness. But there again she provoked Him by disobedience, and once more He lifted His hand to smite, but lest His honour should be impugned did not make a full end of her. Then He brought her into the fair land of Palestine, but her change of home brought no change of disposition. She adopted the heathen sanctuaries of Canaan, and ranged abroad to Assyria and Babylon to gratify her idolatrous lust. Samaria had been destroyed, yet Jerusalem took no warning by her sister's fate, but plunged deeper in the mire of her unfaithfulness. True daughter of her Hittite mother, her history did not belie her origin. Born, only to be cast with abhorrence into the open field, she moved Yahweh to pity as He saw her lie uncared-for and weltering in her blood, and He saved her from death. Then as she grew to maidenhood, untended and forlorn, He

plighted His troth to her and set His majesty upon her, so that she prospered unto royal estate, and gained renown among the nations for the perfection of her beauty. But she perverted to the basest ends the gifts wherewith His love had endowed her, and became worse even than Sodom or Samaria. Now at length the fury which has so long tormented Him will burst its restraints, and He will be quiet and rest, no longer fretted by her abominations.

This seems to represent a point of view inconsistent with the prophet's strenuous repudiation of vicarious punishment. If from his own generation is required the penalty for Israel's appalling career of wickedness, were the ways of Yahweh equal after all? Does not the prophet's concern for Yahweh's honour lead to conflicting results? At one time Yahweh remits the punishment, that His name may not be profaned among the heathen, but at another time concern for His purity causes Him to react with a drastic vengeance against its violation. In one place Ezekiel argues that the equity of Yahweh forbids that one generation should suffer for another, while elsewhere he seems to represent Yahweh's honour as vindicated by visiting on the prophet's contemporaries the accumulated transgressions of Israel's sinful history. We should probably solve the difficulty by recognising a distinction between the nation and the individuals who compose it. Nation and city have, so to speak, an independent existence of their own, a continuous life, which

stretches from the days of Egyptian bondage to the prophet's own time. He sees that Israel is about to plunge into ruin, and the city is to be destroyed. He stands to plead for Yahweh and make plain the righteousness of His dealings. Thus he comes to draw his great indictment against the nation. He looks away wholly from the individuals who constitute it. Yahweh and Israel, these two and the relations between them, engage his thought. The grace of Yahweh met by Israel's ingratitude, His honour compromised by her infidelities, His anger once and again restrained through pity for His holy Name, such was the tragic story of Yahweh and of her whom in pity He had taken for His bride. That Israel's existence as a nation should be ended, and that Jerusalem and its temple should be destroyed, created a problem for those who believed in the election of Israel and saw in the temple Yahweh's peculiar home. Ezekiel solved it by painting this unrelieved picture of Israel's sordid career of vice, which at last provoked Yahweh to the decisive act, that, for His own sake rather than for hers, He had so long deferred. There is thus no dark mystery in Israel's suffering, her sin has merited it long ago. The only cause for wonder is that Yahweh has spared her so often. It has not been through any compassion for Israel, but lest His reputation among the heathen should be lowered by His apparent inability to protect the people whom He had chosen for His own. This motive had now

ceased to operate as a restraint, for not only had Israel's sin at length become intolerable, but it was injuring His fame among the heathen. Whether He punished or whether He forbore, His reputation must suffer. Accordingly He must first punish Israel for profaning His holy Name before the nations; then He must restore Israel to prove that the exile was not due to His weakness, but was a penalty decreed by His anger. Since the exultation of the heathen over Israel's woes wounded the honour of Israel's God, punishment must be inflicted on them. So determined, in fact, is Yahweh to leave nothing undone, which would enhance His glory, that when Israel is in its own land, He fulfils the old prophecies on the Scythians by dangling the defencelessness of His people as a bait to lure Gog from the land of Magog to attack Israel, to his own ruin. For Yahweh works to magnify His own great Name by a complete destruction of Gog's innumerable hordes, while Israel lifts no finger save to bury the slain and burn their armour and weapons. Thus Yahweh magnifies Himself and sanctifies Himself, and makes Himself known in the eyes of many nations. But while the nations are exterminated that Yahweh may be glorified, Israel's sufferings have become a thing of the past. Not that this nation has deserved better treatment than the others. But neither was it restored mainly because it was Yahweh's favourite. "Not for your sake do I this, saith the Lord Yahweh,

be it known unto you : be ashamed and confounded for your ways, O house of Israel" (Ezek. 36^{32}). Here, as everywhere, the all-sufficient motive for His action is a jealous regard for His own holy Name, and a desire to get Himself honour in the sight of the nations.

To our Christian sentiment, Ezekiel seems in many ways so alien, that it is with difficulty that we can bring ourselves to do him justice. Awed by the majesty of Yahweh, crushed by the consciousness of human frailty, he knows nothing of the glad freedom of the children of God, of rapturous communion or unspeakable peace. He seems to set on the throne of the universe a self-centred egoist, Who bends the whole course of history to magnify His own holy Name. We also think that God has made us for Himself, yet not for His own sake, since there is no self-seeking in Him, but because He knows that He is Himself our highest good. While the very loftiness of our conception of God's love makes all the darker the mystery of the world's pain, it is clear that from Ezekiel's standpoint this problem could hardly arise. Man has no case to plead against God. Yet it is well to be cautious in judging the prophet. To say that his teaching must be pronounced very inadequate from a Christian standpoint is a mere truism. How could it be anything else ? Even the sharp exaggeration and one-sidedness in his doctrine of God and of individual responsibility do not warrant us in

passing a censure. For revelation is often not so much the expression of absolute truth, as of the truth specially adapted to the needs of those who received it. A one-sided emphasis may have been needed to correct exaggeration in the opposite direction. Whatever defect we may recognise from the Christian point of view, it must be admitted that what saved the religion of Israel from dissolution by the subtle penetrating atmosphere of Greek thought and life, was the hard legalistic rind that protected it, which it owed to Ezekiel more than to any other man.

CHAPTER III.

The Servant of Yahweh.

AN interval of about a quarter of a century elapsed between the time when we lose sight of Ezekiel, and the time when the Second Isaiah began his work. Although the exiles seem to have been granted considerable freedom, yet it is clear from the passionate hate of Babylon, which animates the prophecies of her downfall, even more than from the specific allusions to oppression, that they suffered no little from their heathen masters. They had sunk into a dull acquiescence, dismayed by the might of Babylon, overwhelmed by the magnificence of her gods. Yahweh had forgotten His city and His people, and left them naked to the scorn of their enemies. Prophets had foretold the rise of their avenger, and the speedy downfall of their oppressor. Yet they had not lifted them from their listlessness, or succeeded in quickening the hope that had died in their breast. But now their words seemed to find a justification in the march of events. Cyrus had begun his career of conquest, and though as yet the

exiles could not believe that the great empire which held them as its thralls was destined to its swift destruction, a few prescient souls divined that in Cyrus the word, which cannot return to Yahweh void, was effecting its own fulfilment.

Among these was the author, to whom we owe Isa. 40–55, one of Israel's greatest prophets, one of the world's chief masters in literature. The Second Isaiah, for so he is usually called, since his name is unknown, bids his people rouse themselves from their despondency. He strikes the keynote of his prophecy in its lovely opening, the music of which still echoes in the English translation: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye to the heart of Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: that she hath received at Yahweh's hand double for all her sins" (Isa. $40^{1,2}$). It is not necessary for me to linger over some of his great doctrines: his magnificent vindication of Yahweh as the only God, proved by His power to predict, and therefore to control the future, the lofty descriptions of His government in Nature and History, His graciousness in pardon, His tenderness to the weak. All these thoughts are set forth with a wonderful combination of sweetness and force. But these are not the deepest, as they are not the original element in his prophecy. That is to be found in his treatment of the hard problem of Israel's suffering, and his great conception of the Servant of Yahweh. The keenest

controversy of recent times in the interpretation of the Old Testament has raged now for several years about the figure of the Servant. The view here adopted is that the Servant of Yahweh is not an individual but the Israelitish nation. It is desirable to reserve the discussion of the views, which have been recently put forward, and the defence of the view here adopted for the Appendix, and to assume here the results, which I shall there seek to make good. I assume, further, as probable, though not demonstrated, that the four so-called "Servant of Yahweh poems" (42^{1-4}, 49^{1-6}, 50^{4-9}, 52^{13}—53^{12}) were inserted in their present position by the Second Isaiah himself, and were his own composition, though written perhaps somewhat earlier.

The prophet accepts the sin of Israel as a partial explanation of its suffering (40^{2}, $42^{24, 25}$, 43^{22-28}, 50^{1}) and attributes its punishment to Yahweh's wrath (42^{25}, 47^{6}, 51^{17-23}, 54^{6-9}). He even reminds us of Ezekiel in the assertion that it is for the sake of His Name that Yahweh does not execute the extreme penalty upon His people (48^{9-11}). Yet his thought dwells far more on Yahweh's love and His pardoning grace, displayed in the redemption of Israel from Babylon. In language of great beauty he again and again thrills his readers with the outpourings of Yahweh's affection for Zion and for Israel. Zion may say "Yahweh has forgotten me," and Israel may utter the hopeless lament "My way is hid from the Lord and my judgment is passed away from my

God." But though a mother may forget her child, He cannot forget Zion. She is graven on the palms of His hands and her walls are ever before Him. Tempest-tossed and disconsolate, Jerusalem shall yet arise from the dust, and put on her beautiful array, shall be established in righteousness, and her walls shall flash with the fire of precious stones. Other nations shall be the ransom price for Israel, the divorced wife shall return to her husband, the bereaved mother see with glad amazement a multitude of children. The old transgressions shall be cancelled, and Israel shall be saved with an everlasting salvation. Far from all oppression and terror, upheld and comforted by Yahweh, she is to be gathered with great mercies, and with everlasting kindness He will have compassion on her.

Along with all the splendid assertions of monotheism, which have given such lustre to the prophecy, the reader finds other elements logically incompatible with monotheism, but characteristic of a religion which sank from its loftiest flights of universalism into a narrow nationalism. Paul's deduction of universalism from the unity of God, that if God is one, He must be the God of Gentile as well as Jew (Rom. $3^{29, 30}$), was not indeed foreign to this prophet's thought. But he had not grasped all that was involved in it, that there is no respect of nations with God, that He can have no favourite people. Hence his doctrine that Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba, were to be given as a ransom for Israel, that their labours

and merchandise should become its possession, that the nations should bring back the exiles, that kings should be their nursing fathers and queens their nursing mothers, that they should bow down to Israel with their faces to the earth, and lick the dust of its feet. Yet when we remember how deeply ingrained in the Jewish people was the misinterpretation of its election, as an end in itself rather than as a means to the world's highest good, we shall wonder less at his assertion of Yahweh's favouritism to His chosen Servant, than at the large-hearted conception of Israel's mission to the Gentiles.

While it is in the Servant passages already mentioned, that this thought of Israel's relation to the heathen is most prominent, at once the explanation of its undeserved suffering, and the motive for its restoration, yet in the rest of Isa. 40–55, whether the author be the author of the Servant passages or not, Israel's mission to the heathen is a leading idea. Yahweh bids all the ends of the earth look unto Him and be saved, and declares that to Him every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. This is to be accomplished through the glorious restoration of Israel, at which kings and princes shall arise and worship. Thus Israel becomes a light to the Gentiles, Yahweh's witness to the peoples. "Behold thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not, and a nation that knew not thee shall run unto thee, because of Yahweh thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel; for He hath glorified thee" (55[5]). "Lo,

these shall come from far: and lo, these from the North and from the West; and these from the land of Sinim" (49^{12}). In Wellhausen's words: "There is no God but Yahweh, and Israel is His prophet."

It is in the light of this mission to the heathen that Israel's election to be Yahweh's Servant must be interpreted. Ten or twelve times, apart from the four Servant passages, Israel is described as Yahweh's Servant,[1] and often we have some such phrase as "Thou, Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen." In the far-off past, Yahweh had laid hold of the nation and called it from the ends of the earth. The nation has not always been faithful to its vocation, it has been as unobservant of Yahweh's doing as if it had been blind, as inattentive to His voice as if it had been deaf. But now Yahweh has pardoned the sin of His people, and for its redemption has raised up Cyrus, through whom its glorious restoration is to be accomplished.

Our special problem, however, emerges only very slightly in the main portion of Isa. 40–55, whereas the four Servant passages contain some of the weightiest contributions in the Old Testament toward its solution. It is very unfortunate that the latter part of chapter 53 is so deeply corrupt, that we cannot feel at all sure what the original text

[1] $41^{8,9}$, 42^{19}, 43^{10}, $44^{1,2,21}$, 45^{4}, 48^{20}, 50^{10}. The last of these is doubtful, as there are strong reasons for regarding $50^{10,11}$ as a later appendix to the third Servant passage. The Servant in 50^{10} seems, in fact, to be an individual prophet.

was. At the same time the leading ideas are still sufficiently clear.

In the first of these passages 42^{1-4} Yahweh is the speaker. He introduces the Servant as one whom He holds firmly in His hand, as His chosen in whom He takes delight. Then we learn how he has been prepared for his work,—Yahweh has put His Spirit upon him, and what the mission entrusted to him is,—to bring to the heathen a knowledge of the true religion. Yahweh next describes the quiet methods he adopts in his teaching; unlike the older prophets, he will not loudly proclaim his message in the public ways. And he will be gentle in his treatment of the faintest spark of good or truth in the heathen. He will go steadfastly forward with his mission, until he has established the true religion among the heathen, who are already waiting for his instruction.

In the second passage 49^{1-6} the Servant is himself the speaker. He bids the distant heathen nations hearken, and tells them how Yahweh has chosen him from his birth, prepared him for his prophetic work, kept him in His protection, till the time was ripe, and announced to him his call to be His servant, through whom He would win Himself glory. Looking back over his career, the Servant confesses his failure, nevertheless expresses his confidence in God. Now Yahweh, Who called him from his birth to be His servant, has told him, that to bring back Israel from exile is too slight a work for Him to accomplish,

so He will make the Servant a light of the nations, that His salvation may be to the ends of the earth.

In the third passage, 50^{4-9}, the Servant is again the speaker. It is true that the Servant is not named, but the poem must belong to the cycle of Servant passages, on account of its close affinities with the other members of the group. It is needed, in fact, to form the transition from the two earlier poems, in which the Servant is simply the teacher of the nations, to the last passage 52^{13}-53^{12}, in which the martyrdom and exaltation of the Servant are the main theme. The Servant begins his soliloquy with a description of his close relation to Yahweh, Who has given him "the tongue of disciples," that is the faculty of trained speech, by which he can utter the needful word. Yahweh Himself is his instructor, and every morning reveals His message to him, not in night visions, but in his waking hours. This message he has loyally accepted, though it has brought him cruel indignity and punishment, which he has patiently endured, not flinching from the task appointed to him. For Yahweh is his helper, therefore he felt no shame, and set his face resolutely like a flint, to accomplish his work. Strong in the assurance that God is his vindicator, he boldly challenges any adversary to contend with him. Since Yahweh has become his helper, he confidently anticipates the destruction of his foes.

The fourth passage 52^{13}-53^{12} is by far the most important, but also the most difficult. The text is

in places very corrupt, so much so in the latter part of 53, that it is impossible to restore it with any confidence. It is also unfortunate that the division of chapters, perhaps never so disastrous as here, has been so effected as to conceal from the ordinary reader that the poem begins with 52^{13} not with 53^{1}. The unique place, that the passage holds in the affections of Christendom, has tended to emphasise the view that 53 is complete in itself. It should also be added that the current Christian interpretation, however just may be the application of the chapter to Christ, has disguised the fact from the vast majority of readers, that this was not the application in the mind of the writer, who meant Israel by the Servant.

The passage opens with Yahweh's prediction of His Servant's approaching exaltation. Just as many had turned with abhorrence from his countenance, disfigured so as to seem no longer human, so many nations will be startled and kings dumb with amazement at this unexpected elevation. By a fine transition the prophet introduces a confession by the nations, heightening the effect by leaving the identity of the speakers to be inferred. Amazed at the wondrous tidings of the Servant's exaltation they burst into speech with the question: "Who could have believed that which we have heard?" But how were they to know that this glorious destiny was reserved for Israel, since Yahweh's wonder-working power had not before been revealed to them?

And while they had received no intimation of this splendid reverse of fortune that awaited him, the previous career of the Servant amply excused their failure to forecast his future. His origin was poor and contemptible, he grew up before his fellow-nations like a dwarfed plant in a barren soil. They found nothing attractive in him, but rather despised and forsook him, for he was smitten with a disease, whose ravages made his appearance so repulsive, that men turned in loathing from him. Now the nations confess how utterly they had misconceived the truth. While they looked on the Servant as proved by his sufferings to be an exceptional victim of Divine wrath, it was their own pain and sickness that he was enduring. Their rebellion caused his suffering, his chastisement procured their peace and wrought out their healing. They had gone astray in self-will, and Yahweh had inflicted on him the penalty of their sin. With lamb-like meekness he endured oppression, and was taken away without justice, while none pondered on his fate, that he was smitten to death for the sin of the nations. After his death he was buried in a dishonoured grave, though he was innocent of violence or deceit. So men had judged, but Yahweh judged otherwise. He justified His Servant and delivered him from trouble, satisfied him with a long-lived posterity. In the eyes of the nations the Servant shall be justified, since he has borne their sins. Thus springing out of his career of sacrifice and vicarious atonement,

though that career seemed to close in ignominy and death, will come the Servant's exaltation, when restored to life he becomes the equal of the great rulers of the world.

The following translation is offered as representing something like the original Hebrew text of the four passages, though in some cases we are reduced to quite uncertain restoration.

I. Isa. 42^{1-4}.

Lo! my Servant,[2] whom I hold fast,[3]
My chosen, in whom my soul hath pleasure;
I have put my spirit upon him,
Judgment[4] will he bring forth to the nations.
He will not cry nor lift up,[5]
And he will not make his voice heard in the street.

[2]The LXX. reads here, "Jacob, my Servant," and in the next line "Israel, my chosen." This is correct as an interpretation, but is probably an insertion under the influence of 44^{1}, 45^{4}, cf. 41^{8}, where the names occur in an inverse order. The insertion here disturbs the rhythm.

[3]Cf. 41^{10}, where Israel is similarly described.

[4]Judgment means here the whole complex of religious ordinances, hence like the similar use of the Arabic *dîn*, as the commentators remind us, is equivalent to the true religion.

[5]"Lift up," *i.e.*, lift up his voice. Some read *yish'ag* "will roar" instead of *yissa'*, but, as Giesebrecht objects, the word seems too strong. The contrast is often supposed to be with the more demonstrative character of earlier prophecy. This suits an individual better than a national interpretation, and we should probably think of Israel as fulfilling its vocation for the world by quiet missionary activity, not by participation in the politics of great empires. The Servant, as Marti says, follows the method of his Lord, whose working is beautifully compared by Isaiah to "the waters of Shiloah that go softly" (7^{6}).

A bruised reed he will not break,
And a glimmering wick he will not quench.[6]
To the peoples[7] he will bring forth judgment,
He will not glimmer nor be crushed,[8]
Till he set judgment in the earth,
And for his teaching the far lands wait.[9]

II. Isa. 49 $^{1-6}$.

Hearken ye far lands to me,
And listen ye distant peoples:
Yahweh hath called me from my birth,
From my mother's womb hath He made mention of my name.

Nevertheless, since the author conceived of Israel as Yahweh's prophet to the world, there seems to be no reason why the form of his description may not have been determined by a tacit contrast to the shrill utterances of the prophets in the crowded streets.

[6] Since the Servant has no function to fulfil except for the heathen, the meaning is that he will cherish and strengthen the faint sparks of truth which are to be found among them; there is no reference to any efforts to rekindle the smouldering flame of truth or goodness in Israel.

[7] The pointed text reads *le'ĕmeth*, which should probably be translated "in accordance with truth." But it is better to alter the pointing with Giesebrecht, and read *l'ummōth* "to the peoples." We thus get a correspondence with verse 1, "Judgment will he bring forth to the nations."

[8] For *yārūts* we should with Ewald and many others, following the Codex Babylonicus, read *yērōts* (Imperfect niphal of *ratsats*).

[9] The last line is not a continuation of the preceding, dependent on "till." It is an independent sentence asserting that the heathen are already eagerly desiring the truth, which the Servant is to bring them, a thought for which the preceding verse prepares us. For this wonderfully liberal estimate of the heathen we may compare Mal. 1 ^{11}, and the beautiful description of their willingness to receive the truth, given in the Book of Jonah.

And He made my mouth like a keen blade,
In the shadow of His hand He hid me,
And He made me a polished arrow,[10]
In His quiver He concealed me.
And He said to me "Thou art my servant,
Israel,[11] in whom I will get myself glory."
But I said "In vain have I toiled,
Idly and to no purpose have I exhausted my strength:
Nevertheless my right is with Yahweh,
And my reward with my God."
And now saith Yahweh,—
Who formed me from the womb to be His Servant,
To bring back Jacob to Himself,
And that Israel might be gathered to Him,[12]
And I was honoured in the eyes of Yahweh,
And my God was my strength—

[10] This is the usual translation, but Buhl (Gesenius-Buhl *sub voce*) thinks it means "sharpened arrow."

[11] Duhm, of course, strikes out "Israel" as an incorrect gloss. Even some of those, who accept the identification of the Servant with Israel, admit that this is possible even if not probable (so Skinner, Marti and Giesebrecht, the last of these thinking that there may be an intentional mystery hanging over the identification of the Servant). There is no solid reason whatever for assuming it to be a gloss, unless we adopt the view that the Servant is an individual. The balance of clauses is disturbed by its removal. All the versions read it, and it is omitted only in one Hebrew MS. (Kennicott 96). Giesebrecht thinks the whole of verse 3 may be an insertion. His reasons are not conclusive, they are stated in a footnote on p. 49 of his *Der Knecht Jahves*.

[12] $49^{5,6}$ has been a stronghold of those who hold that the Servant cannot be identified with the empirical Israel, since in these verses they seem to be expressly distinguished, and it seems to be affirmed that part of the Servant's mission is to restore Israel from exile. There are weighty antecedent objections to this, which are stated in the Appendix (pp. 188, 189). Yet the passage does not demand this interpretation,

"Too slight a thing is it to raise up the tribes of Jacob,[13]
And to bring back the preserved of Israel,
So I make thee a light of the nations,
That My salvation may be to the ends of the earth."

though the immediate impression it makes perhaps favours it. Yet Duhm, in spite of his vigorous rejection of the national theory, thinks that there is no reference here to a restoration of Israel by the Servant. Unfortunately the text of 49^5 is uncertain. It is not necessary to discuss the text here, since the general sense is plain that the passage speaks of a bringing back of Israel to Yahweh. The crucial question is Who brings Israel back? Usually it is said that it is the Servant, in which case a distinction between Israel and the Servant would seem to be made out. Some scholars, however, including Duhm, insist that it is Yahweh. This harmonises much better with the general language of the prophet, since nowhere else have we the faintest hint that this function is entrusted to the Servant. We could accordingly freely translate That he might bring back Jacob to Himself. The reference is apparently to the return from Babylon to Yahweh's land, though Budde ingeniously refers it to the Exodus translating "In that he brought Jacob again (out of Egypt) to him, and drew Israel to him (into the desert)" (*American Journal of Theology* iii., p. 520 = *Ebed-Jahwe Lieder*, pp. 22, 23). This connects very well with the mention of Israel's call in the preceding verse, but it is improbable since the reference is surely to the same event as in verse 6, *i.e.*, the restoration from exile. In any case there is no need to think of the Servant as restoring Israel, the contradiction and other difficulties thus created outweighing the impression which the words themselves most naturally give. Giesebrecht, however, argues at length and very forcibly that the two lines translated above, "To bring back Jacob to Himself and that Israel might be gathered," should be struck out as a gloss, occasioned by the gloss in verse 6 (*Der Knecht Jahves*, pp. 40—46). I think that he may quite probably be right, and certainly the present text is very awkward; but it is rather drastic treatment, and for our purpose we may well be content with the result that Yahweh and not the Servant is represented as restoring Israel.

[13]The present Hebrew text was, before Dillmann, explained as in the translation of the Revised Version: "It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be my Servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to

III. Isa. 50 4–9.

The Lord Yahweh hath given me
A disciples' tongue,
That I might know to answer the godless
With upright words.[14]

restore the preserved of Israel." This clearly means that part of the Servant's function is to restore Israel from exile. But Dillmann pointed out in his note on the passage that if the prophet had meant what earlier commentators had supposed him to mean, the Hebrew would have been different. We must accordingly translate the present text with Dillmann: "Too light a thing for thy being my Servant is it to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel." This may be explained in two ways (*a*) It is not worthy of the Servant's position that he should simply restore Israel from exile. (*b*) It is not worthy of the Servant's position that Yahweh should restore Israel from exile. But the Hebrew, as thus correctly interpreted, is very clumsy. Duhm drew what seems to be the necessary inference that the words, "for thy being my Servant," are a gloss. In this he has been followed by Cheyne, Marti, and Giesebrecht. When these words are struck out, and we translate as above, the passage most naturally means that Yahweh considers the restoration of Israel from exile too light a thing for Him to accomplish, so He will make Israel a light to the nations. The line is virtually equivalent to "Too slight a thing is it for Me to raise up the tribes of Jacob." The gloss probably originated through a marginal note, intended to explain in what respect the restoration of Israel was "too slight a thing." It was too slight for the Servant's position as Servant of Yahweh. When the gloss is omitted there remains no reason for distinguishing between the Servant and Israel and supposing that the former has a task to accomplish for the latter.

[14] The present text is translated in the R.V., "That I should know how to sustain with words him that is weary." This is open to serious objections. We have no other occurrence of a verb *'ūth* in Hebrew. If it is correctly read here its meaning can only be conjectured, "sustain" or "refresh" suits the mention of "the weary." The general drift of the passage, however, suggests rather that a mention of the Servant's adversaries should come here instead of the weary.

In the morning He awakeneth mine ear
To hear like disciples.
The Lord Yahweh hath opened
For me the ear ;[15]
And I was not rebellious,
I turned not backward.[16]

Further *dūbār* should hardly mean "with words," for this we expect a preposition to be prefixed. The following words are also suspicious (as the insertion of Paseq suggests). They are *yā'īr babbōqer babbōqer wā'īr*, "he wakeneth in the morning in the morning he wakeneth." At first sight Duhm's suggestion, accepted by Marti and Cheyne (*Sacred Books of the Old Testament*), that "he wakeneth in the morning" should be struck out as incorrect dittography of the following words, seems the best solution. We should, on the whole, however, have expected the words in that case to have been repeated in the same order. It seems plain that the repetition of *babbōqer* "in the morning" has arisen through dittography, so it may be struck out. We have then to emend the preceding words. For *la'ăth* it is simplest to read with Graetz, followed by Duhm and Giesebrecht (*Der Knecht Jahves*, p. 54), *la'ănōth* "to answer," which involves an extremely slight alteration of the Hebrew. For *yā'ēph*, "the weary," I have adopted Duhm's suggestion *chānēph*, "the godless." There remains *dūbār yā'īr*. We can change *yā'īr* into *yāshār*, "an upright word," or we can read *dibrē yōsher*, "words of uprightness" assuming that the *yod* at the end of the first word has fallen out because the next word began with it. This is the emendation adopted above.

[15] Duhm, followed by Cheyne and Marti, omits this couplet as a variant of the clause "in the morning he wakeneth mine ear" in the preceding verse. Perhaps the connexion is improved by the omission, but there is no decisive reason for it.

[16] The Servant asserts his loyal acceptance of Yahweh's message. It is quite possible that the author of the Book of Jonah had this passage in his mind when he represented Israel as refusing the mission, to which God had called her through the Second Isaiah, to proclaim to the heathen the knowledge of the true God.

My back I gave to smiters,[17]
And my cheeks to those who plucked out the hair,
My face I hid not
From shame and spittle.
But the Lord Yahweh helpeth me,
Therefore I was not ashamed;
Therefore I made my face like flint,[18]
And knew that I should not be ashamed.
Near is He that justifieth[19] me, who will strive with me?
Let us stand forth together!
Who is mine adversary?
Let him draw near to me!
Lo! the Lord Yahweh helpeth me,
Who is he that shall condemn me?
Lo! all of them shall be worn out as a garment,
The moth will devour them.[20]

[17] See the very striking parallel, Psalm 129^3, "The plowers plowed upon my back; They made long their furrows." The sufferer who speaks in this Psalm is definitely said to be Israel, and the afflictions are those suffered by the nation from its youth. This shows that the whole of the description of persecution in this verse may have a reference to the sufferings of Israel, culminating in the exile. It is clear why the Servant says in the previous verse that he had not been rebellious. He had been exposed to persecution, but he had not quailed before it.

[18] For the metaphor cf. Ezek. $3^{8,9}$; for the thought Jer. $1^{18,19}$.

[19] To justify is to pronounce in the right.

[20] Cf. Isa. 51^{6-8}.

IV. Isa. 52^{13}—53^{12}.

Lo! my servant Israel[21] shall be exalted,
He shall be lifted up and be very high.
Even as many were appalled at him,[22]

[21] The Hebrew text reads *yaskīl*. The R.V. renders the word in its usual sense "shall deal prudently," but the context requires the sense given in the margin, "shall prosper." Duhm strikes out the word, on account of its unsuitability, in its usual sense, to the context. It is possible to translate as in R.V. margin, and this would be better than simply striking it out. Cheyne now gets the same sense by reading *yatsliach* (*Critica Biblica*, p. 45). But the accumulation of four, largely synonymous, verbs is not what we should expect, and it seems much better to accept Budde's brilliant emendation *yisrā'ēl* "Israel." It is not difficult, and is supported by 49^3. Marti adopts it. Giesebrecht thinks it rather arbitrary (see also the note on "Israel" in 49^3 p. 46), and retains the present text, translating "shall prosper."

[22] The text of verse 14 certainly needs considerable emendation. It is clear in the first place that for "at thee" we should, with the Peshitta and Targum, read "at him," the change to the second person being very awkward. Next, the present text creates a very serious difficulty by inserting a parenthesis introduced by "so" after a protasis beginning with "as." In this way the reader is misled into thinking at first that this "so" introduces the apodosis, but, as he reads on, discovers that he is mistaken, and that the apodosis is really introduced only with verse 15. The writer is hardly likely to be responsible for a confused sentence of this kind. The objection is disguised from the English reader by removing "so" from the beginning of the clause, and by marking it as a parenthesis. We might mitigate the difficulty by assuming with Duhm that a line has fallen out after "even as many were appalled at him," containing the apodosis. Duhm suggests, "so shall he shine forth before many;" Cheyne (*Sacred Books of the Old Testament*), "so will many in him take delight." This proceeds from the probably correct feeling that a line is required to complete the parallelism. But, apart from the parenthesis, the connexion with verse 15 remains difficult. Marti suggested a more drastic remedy. He transferred the parenthesis to the end of 53^2, and thus brought protasis and apodosis together. He

[And princes shuddered at him],
(For marred so as not to be human was his visage,
And his form so as not to be that of the sons of men),
So shall he startle[23] many nations,
At him kings shall shut their mouths,
For what was not told them they see,
And what they did not hear they consider.

agreed with Duhm that a line has been lost, but thought that it contained a parallel to the preceding line and not its apodosis. In this way he got two parallel lines in the protasis corresponding to the two in the apodosis. Since in verse 15 "kings" is parallel to "many nations," he suggested for the missing line, "And princes shuddered at him," *wᵉśārîm saʿărū ʿālāyw*. The reference to "princes" is supported by 49⁷, and the assonance may also commend this reconstruction. I have inserted the clause in square brackets above, to indicate that something of this kind originally stood in the text. Giesebrecht is convinced that a line has been lost, but does not attempt to restore it. I have not followed Marti, however, in removing the parenthesis. Giesebrecht's objection that it is much too strong to be appropriate after 53² seems to me to be sound. The real objection to it is not that it is a parenthesis, but that it is introduced by "so." Giesebrecht removes this by the very simple remedy of changing *kēn* "so" into *kî* "for," and I have followed him in my translation.

[23] This is a famous *crux*. The word *yazzeh* is Hiphil of *nāzāh*. It is used elsewhere only in the sense of sprinkling a liquid in ceremonial acts. It is not used like the English "sprinkle," with an accusative of the person on whom the liquid is sprinkled. We cannot, therefore, translate "so shall he sprinkle many nations." The only sense we could impose on the word, if the meaning "sprinkle" is retained, would be that the Servant should scatter nations, as water is scattered when it is sprinkled. It is generally agreed that this sense is impossible here, straining the language, and out of harmony with the relations between the Servant and the nations as elsewhere described. The view now usually taken is that it means "to cause to spring up," "to startle," this sense being derived from the Arabic word *nazâ*, "to leap." I have adopted this in the translation, though with some

"Who could have believed that which we have heard?[24]
But to whom was the arm of Yahweh revealed?

misgivings. Cheyne objects that the word is rare in Arabic classical literature, and that Hebrew has so many words for "leap" that it is unnecessary to have recourse to Arabic. Followed by Marti, he has suggested *yishtachăwū*, which occurs in the parallel 49[7], "So shall many nations bow down before him." Moore, followed by Duhm, reads *yirgᵉzū* "shall be moved."

[24] At this point the prophet introduces a confession by speakers, who are left unnamed. This is in accordance with his custom elsewhere, each of the Servant passages opens without any mention of the speaker. It is here assumed that the heathen are the speakers, the reasons for this conclusion are given in the Appendix (pp. 185–187). For the translation "Who could have believed?" see Giesebrecht *Beiträge*, p. 159. Budde *Ebed Jahwe-Lieder*, p. 14, n. 2, aptly compares *mī millēl*, "who would have said?" Gen. 21[7]. The expression is probably borrowed from colloquial speech, and is like our phrase "Who would have thought it?" The translation "our report" is very unfortunate. The nations ask: Who could have believed the tidings we have now heard? In the shock of surprise caused by the Servant's exaltation, to which reference has just been made, the "many nations" break forth into this expression of their astonishment. There is no real contradiction between this and the statement that "kings shall shut their mouths." Both convey the same thought, the extreme amazement of the heathen. A poet may in one sentence represent them as dumb with astonishment, and in the next as uttering that astonishment in speech, without exposing himself to any charge of inconsistency, except from very prosaic readers. Nor is the objection, urged by Prof. Skinner, conclusive, that the nations "are surprised by the Servant's exaltation because they had not previously heard of it; those who now speak confess a deeper fault, they have heard but did not believe." The whole tone of what follows appears to show that the speakers, while confessing their misconception, urge that there was abundant excuse for it. The second line of 53[1] accordingly seems to mean that their former attitude to the Servant was not to be wondered at, since none of them had received any revelation of the great act Yahweh was about to accomplish.

For he grew up as a sapling before us,[25]
And as a root out of a dry ground,
He had no form that we should look upon him,
No visage that we should desire him,[26]
Despised and forsaken of men,[27]
A man of pains and familiar with sickness,
And as one from whom men hide the face,
Despised, and we regarded him not.
But it was our sickness, that he bore,
And our pains, he carried them,
While we regarded him as stricken,[28]
Smitten of God and afflicted.

[25] With Ewald and several others, it is better to read *l'phānēynū* "before us" than *l'phānāyw* "before him," though Duhm, Skinner, and Budde still retain the latter. Marti suggests *l'phānīm* "aforetime."

[26] Duhm and Cheyne omit *w'nir'ēhū* (translated in R.V. "and when we see him") as due to dittography of *mar'eh* "visage." But this destroys the parallelism. It is much better to retain the word and, disregarding the accents, connect it with the preceding words, as in R.V. margin. We thus gain a parallelism of the two lines. In that case, since the former of the two lines contains two substantives as against one in the second line, Bertholet's suggestion that we should delete *w'lo hādār* "nor comeliness" is very plausible.

[27] Cheyne, followed by Marti, suspects *wachŭdal īshīm* "forsaken of men." The form *īshīm* as the plural of *īsh* occurs in Psa. 141^4, Prov. 8^4, but it is unusual, and coming immediately before *īsh* is surprising. Suspicion is strengthened by the fact that the word after *īsh* begins with *m*, so that *īshīm* might have arisen through dittography of what follows. On the other hand, the present text is fine, and supported by the context.

[28] By "stricken" we are probably to understand a leper, the word was used specially in this sense, the leper being regarded as suffering in an eminent degree from a stroke of God. The loathsome appearance and exclusion from society suggest the same view. It is an interesting coincidence that Manetho asserted that the Hebrews partly sprang from the lepers of Egypt.

But he was pierced[29] through our rebellions,
Crushed through our sins,
The chastisement to win our peace was upon him,
And by his stripes was healing wrought for us.
We had all gone astray like sheep,[30]
We had turned each his own way,
And Yahweh made to light on him
The sin of us all.
He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself
And opened not his mouth,
As a lamb that is led to the slaughter,
And as a sheep before its shearers is dumb.[31]
Excluded from judgment he was taken away,[32]

[29] *Mᵉchōlāl* is usually regarded as a Poal participle of *chālal*, and translated "pierced." Cheyne considers this to be questionable, and points *mᵉchullāl*, which he translates "dishonoured."

[30] The reference is probably to the idolatry of the heathen.

[31] The words "and he opened not his mouth" at the close of verse 7 are probably an incorrect repetition from the previous part of the verse. It disturbs the parallelism.

[32] At this point both text and interpretation begin to be uncertain. The first line is very variously translated. The R.V. translation gives to *min* the sense "by"; the meaning is then that although his death was the result of a judicial process, it was nevertheless an act of unjustifiable oppression. The R.V. margin translates *min* by "from," and the meaning is, in that case, that he was released from his life of oppression. This gives a good general sense, but "judgment" is not very clear. Others translate "Without hindrance and without right he was taken away," which means that no one interfered to prevent his death, which took place without regard to right. Marti suggests a very easy emendation *'ātsūr mimmishpāt* "excluded from judgment." This involves little more than a transposition of consonants. This is adopted above. I would suggest as an alternative to the explanation he gives of the corruption that the first letter of the verse may have arisen through dittography of the two preceding letters.

And his fate[33] who considered it,
That he was cut off out of the land of the living,
That for our rebellions[34] he was smitten to death?[35]

[33]The present text *dōrō* is a well-known *crux*. The word means, according to its usual significance, "his generation." The translation "who shall declare his generation?" is out of the question. The R.V. translation "and as for his generation who *among them* considered" is quite admissible, but not at all the obvious rendering of the Hebrew. It is possible to follow Knobel and translate "his dwelling-place" as in Isa. 38^{12}. Duhm accepts this translation, and takes the meaning to be, who asks after his dwelling-place with God? Skinner prefers to think of his earthly dwelling-place, no one cares to ask about it, he has vanished from the thoughts of men. The word in this sense, however, is very rare, and borrowed from Aramaic. It is simplest, though as Duhm says not necessary, to read with Cheyne, who is followed by Marti, *darkō* "his way," *i.e.*, "his fate" (cf. Psa. 37^5, Isa. 40^{27}).

[34]The text reads "for the rebellion of my people." This seems to constitute an insuperable objection to the identification of the Servant with Israel, since here the Servant is said to be smitten for Israel's rebellion. Since, however, according to our results elsewhere, the national interpretation is a fixed point for us, we must rather seek to bring this passage into harmony with that view. "My people" is strange in this context. If the first person refers to Yahweh this creates difficulties, for both before and after in this context (verses 1, 6, 10), Yahweh is spoken of in the third person, He does not Himself resume His speech till verse 11. It is also unlikely that the prophet should here refer to himself. Elsewhere he keeps his own personality in the background, why should he intrude it here? The first person is used in 53^{1-6}, but it is the first person plural. If the prophet includes himself among those who speak in 53^{1-6}, why should he all at once pass from the plural to the singular, and now speak as though he were not included among those for whom the Servant suffered? Moreover, when we remember that the text of the latter part of the chapter is very corrupt, and it is generally agreed that the two following words have to be emended, we are perfectly justified in suspecting its soundness here. Of the emendations proposed I think Budde's, adopted by Marti, *nipp'sha'ēnu*, "for our rebellions," in place of *mippesha' 'ammī* is best. The present text has arisen partly from dittography of

And his grave was made with the wicked,
And with workers of evil his tomb,[36]
Although he had done no violence,
And deceit was not in his mouth.

the *Ayin*. The emendation *'ammim*, "peoples," for *'ammī* is very unlikely. Giesebrecht proposed in his *Beiträge* (p. 170) to read *mippish'ām y'nugga'*, "for their transgressions he was smitten." This is transcriptionally easier than Budde's suggestion, and in his most recent discussion he still prefers it. In that case the prophet is speaking, and the speech of the heathen nations has closed with verse 7. In spite of this, I adopt Budde's view, and think that the heathen are still speaking. At what point the speech of the heathen ends is not clear. Since according to the present text Yahweh begins to speak in verse 11, it would perhaps be best to assume that the speech of the heathen continues to the line translated above, "A posterity that prolonged its life." It should be pointed out, however, that if in verse 12 we follow the LXX. reading "he shall inherit" instead of "I will divide," the only thing that points to Yahweh as the speaker is the first person suffix in *'abdī*, "my servant." We can feel no certainty that the original text was not *'abdō*, "his servant," the confusion of the two consonants being not uncommon.

[35] The Hebrew text reads *nega' lāmō*. It is possible to translate this, "a stroke was upon him," but the words would naturally be translated, "a stroke was upon them." But this is not in place here, so we might translate as in R.V. margin, "to whom the stroke *was due*." But this is not very natural. The LXX. reads "he was led to death." It is generally agreed that we should read *nugga' lammāweth*, "he was smitten to death." This involves simply the addition of a single consonant.

[36] After his death the Servant was buried in a dishonoured grave. The present text, "And with the rich in his deaths," can hardly be right. We need a synonym for "wicked," and though the poor and godly are identified, we cannot assert the converse of this. It is generally agreed that instead of *'āshīr*, "rich," we should read some such word as *'āshōq*, "the oppressor," or *'ōsē ra'* "workers of evil." The word *b'mōthāyw*, "in his deaths," is also difficult. The plural seems to have no point, but even if we correct into the singular with the LXX., "in his death" is unsatisfactory, since he was, of course, dead

But[37] Yahweh was pleased to justify him,
And rescued his soul from trouble,
Caused him to see light and be satisfied,
A posterity that prolonged its life."

when he was buried. It is better to read with some MSS. *bāmāthō*. Elsewhere *bāmāh* is used only in the sense "high-place." If *bāmāthō* is read here, it must be interpreted as "his sepulchral mound," which gives an excellent parallel to "his grave" in the preceding line. Giesebrecht suggested *matstsabtō*, "his obelisk," in his *Beiträge*, p. 171, but though he refers to this in his *Der Knecht Jahves*, p. 109, he translates "his mound," regarding *bāmāthō* as possible in this sense, though not certain. Cheyne's objection to "his obelisk," that it implies too much honour for the despised subject of the passage, seems to be sound. His own reading *gᵉdīshō* or *gidshō*, "his tomb," adopted by Marti, seems to be too difficult, still more so the very radical emendations in his *Addenda* (*Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, p. 201). Buhl, in the last edition of Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, suggests *bēth mōthō*, "his house of death."

[37] The tenth and eleventh verses are justly regarded by many scholars as almost incurably corrupt. It will be noticed that the translation given above is much shorter than that in the English Version. This rests on the conclusion, which is quite uncertain, but when all is so obscure, perhaps the best, that Marti has considerable ground for his contention that we seem to have several variants preserved. We have *Yahweh chāphēts* and *chēphets Yahweh; tāsīm* and *'āshām; naphshō yir'eh* occurring twice; *hechēli* and *yitslach*. The removal of the variants or repetitions, and the emendation of the text that remains, produces in his hands something like the text translated above. I have, however, in preference to his emendation, "Yahweh was pleased with His Servant," which may, of course, be right (cf. 42^1), adopted Giesebrecht's "Yahweh was pleased to justify him," *chāphēts hatsdīqō* for *chāpēts dakke'ō* (the scribe wrote to the first *ts* and in returning to the text before him started again from the second). This is supported by 50^8. "Yahweh was pleased to crush him" gives a sense quite alien to the passage, and in itself very unlikely. Duhm rightly says that the general sense required is, While men judged the Servant in the way described, Yahweh judged otherwise. He translates, with the LXX.

Righteous shall My Servant appear to many,
Since he bears their iniquities;
Therefore shall he inherit[38] amongst the many,
And with the strong he shall divide the spoil.
Inasmuch as he poured out his soul unto death,
And was numbered with the rebellious,
Though he bore the sin of many,
And interceded for the rebellious.

It is out of the nation's exile that this wonderful series of poems springs. The prophet ponders deeply the significance of this dark experience for the nation's task. What place is he to give it in his theory of Israel's mission? He sets out from the conviction that such a mission has been assigned by Yahweh to His Servant. What else could be the purpose of its choice before it had even begun to be? If it was Israel that was thus called to be Yahweh's Servant the mission committed to it could be only a mission to the world. And we can see how the writer rose to the great thought that Israel was destined to be Yahweh's prophet to the Gentiles. In Babylon he confronted a splendid idolatry, and as he saw the

"Yahweh was pleased to purify him," which can be got out of the present text. It is perhaps not worth while going through the passage in detail, with a view to emending it. The reconstructions by Duhm, Cheyne and Giesebrecht differ much from that here given and from each other.

[38]The LXX. reads, "he shall inherit," instead of "I will divide." With Duhm, Cheyne and Marti I have adopted this, since the change from the third person is unlikely, as is also the repetition of the same verb in the first and second lines.

people of Yahweh crushed by the heel of the heathen, the iron entered into his soul. Hence the contest between Yahweh and the false gods derived much of its interest for him. He knows that Yahweh is the true God, since He alone predicts, and therefore alone shapes the future. To Him the nations must look, forsaking their senseless idolatry. Since Israel, and no other people, possesses the knowledge of Yahweh, what can its mission be but to make Him known to the world? Nor are the heathen wholly unprepared. Beneath the loud devotion to their own deities, the prophet's ear has caught the low undertone of a worthier aspiration. Their souls are stirred with a vague disquiet, a dim sense of higher truth, a longing for the "authentic voice" to change the soaring wish to a luminous certainty. "For his teaching the far lands do wait." Not only, however, has Israel been selected for this vocation, but Yahweh is training His Servant to fulfil it. Equipped with His Spirit, and taught by His own intimate revelations, he knows how to give the right answer, and has learnt a tender respect for the faintest gleams of light that struggle to exist in heathenism. But all this preparation, which has made Israel as fit for its work as a keen blade for battle, seemed now to have been stultified. The nation had been bitterly persecuted, and had lost its life. Ezekiel had already depicted the destruction of Israel's national existence by the exile as a death, and had prophesied that it would be undone in the restoration. The

same metaphor is used here to express the same idea. Why then should this strange fate have befallen the Servant? A partial answer lay ready to hand. The suffering of the Servant was a martyrdom, endured because he was faithful to his task. It was no strange thing for a Hebrew prophet to meet with persecution at the hands of his countrymen, whose vices he had rebuked, or whose cherished prejudices he had outraged. That Israel, as Yahweh's prophet to the heathen, should suffer and be slain, lay quite in the line of a too common experience. The Servant loyally accepted the work assigned to him, and resolutely hardened himself against ill-treatment from the nations. But while the individual prophet could suffer and die for the cause, and his place be filled by successors, this was not possible in the case of the nation. The ancient choice, the long training, could not be nullified by its extinction. The death of Israel meant no more than that the nation had ceased to exist as such. But still all its constituent elements survived, with a racial consciousness and the memory of its past, so that resurrection meant simply a return to Palestine and a renewed corporate life. It was therefore involved in the election of Israel that national death should be followed by national resurrection. The nations that had watched with contempt the puny people come into existence, and had turned with abhorrence from it, so ghastly was it, covered with wounds and smitten with loathsome disease, will see with amazement its

exaltation and learn how deeply they had misconceived the long tragedy that had culminated in its death. And as they confess their misconception, the question presses upon them, how is this tragedy to be explained? The explanation they had formerly given is now seen to be untrue. The sufferings of Israel are not a signal proof of Divine disfavour; that is suggested, if not proved, by their glorious sequel. But it is not difficult to see how the nations came to understand what deep significance lay in Israel's martyrdom. Israel was Yahweh's people, it alone knew the true God, and resolutely held firmly to Him. They on the other hand, had gone astray into self-willed idolatry. But now how strangely fate had dealt out its awards. The innocent Israel had suffered and been slain, while the guilty nations had lived. There had been a reversal of parts, the innocent had suffered, the guilty had escaped. Filled with contrition for their sin, and recognising that through Israel has come their knowledge of the true God, as their mind dwells on the guiltless sufferer, what thought could rise in their breast but this: Israel has suffered the penalty which we deserved? Not only is he Yahweh's prophet, but he is the vicarious sufferer for our sin. But there worked within his suffering a regenerative power. Not only did his long martyrdom expiate the idolatry of the heathen. It was the means to their healing; the chastisement that won their peace. They gain a true insight into the deep things of the

Spirit, of which no proof is so striking as the fact, that the prophet makes this confession spring out of the overwhelming impression they receive from the suffering and glory of the Servant, a confession profound and penetrating to the core of things, as but few passages in the Old Testament.

That the prophet rightly regarded it as Israel's mission to teach the heathen the true religion will hardly be denied. That the Jews accepted rather the ideals of Ezekiel, and on their return to Palestine, shrank from the task to which the great prophet of the exile had called them, became hard, narrow and exclusive, must not lead us too hastily to condemn them. Probably it was inevitable that the ideals of the Second Isaiah, like those of Jeremiah, should wait till their time was ripe. Spiritual religion was as yet too weak for Judaism to take such soaring flights. First of all, it must make its own position secure, then attempt the conquest of the world. The truths, which Jeremiah and the Second Isaiah had taught, lay hidden within that hard shell, and had they not been so protected might have been lost to the world. Yet it can only be with pain that we think how long-continued the exclusiveness of Judaism has been. The author of the Book of Jonah, perhaps next to Jeremiah the greatest of the Hebrew Prophets, urged his countrymen to accept the mission to the heathen, and sought to convince them how ready they were for the truth. But his noble protest fell on deaf ears; his generous estimate of the Gentiles

found no echo in the Jewish heart. So when the time came for Judaism frankly to throw off its racial limitations and become a universal religion, it made the great refusal, and Christianity had to develop in almost entire independence of it. Yet it would be unworthy to forget how vast is the debt we owe to Jewish teachers, and how amply the promise that Israel should be a light of the Gentiles has been redeemed.

It is less easy for us to sympathise with the prophet's doctrine that Israel had been the vicarious sufferer for the world's sin. It seems at first sight so out of touch with reality, so calm in its defiance of patent facts. The objection can, indeed, be dealt with only in the light of wider applications of the principle involved in it. It is, however, plain that here the prophet assigned a function to Israel, to which, in the nature of things, a nation is inadequate. It would, I believe, be mistaken to infer from this that he had in mind simply the pious kernel of the nation or the ideal Israel. Each of these is exposed to grave difficulties of an exegetical kind, while they cut the prophecy away from its historical root. Nevertheless while the Servant is the actual nation, and the exile is the death in which its afflictions have culminated, it is that nation looked at from the point of view of function. Israel is in a measure idealised, since in his absolute way of stating his doctrine, the prophet looks away from the imperfect realisation of the function assigned to it, and speaks

as if it had completely achieved the ideal which God had set before it.

From the first, Christianity has seen in the description of the Suffering Servant a prediction of Jesus of Nazareth. It is, however, a firmly established result of exegesis that this was not at all in the prophet's mind. He does not intend by the Servant of Yahweh a figure that is to come centuries later than his own time. This Servant has already lived and died, and the prophet utters his oracle after the death, but before the resurrection of the Servant. Moreover, in common with many interpreters, I am convinced that he intends by the Servant, not an individual at all but the Israelitish nation, though several scholars do not accept this view. Are we, then, to say that the Church has been wrong in its interpretation? I have already said that a nation could not be adequate to the functions here assigned to the Servant. We may solve the difficulty if we can identify Jesus with Israel. Now, as we have already seen, while the author no doubt thinks of the empirical Israel, yet Israel's significance as the Servant of Yahweh consists essentially in the fact that it is the revealer of Yahweh to the nations, and the vicarious sufferer for their sin. If then the qualities, which constituted for the prophet Israel's essential meaning, its place in universal history, were qualities which existed in a very mixed and imperfect form in the nation, but were embodied and perfectly realized in an individual,

we may speak of that individual as concentrating within Himself the essential Israel. Now we believe that this is precisely the place Jesus fills in history, and that the functions, only partially fulfilled by Israel, were completely discharged by Him. In Him the long revelation of God in Israel attained its climax and reached its goal. It lay in the nature of things that no collective body could perfectly reveal God. For truth about God is no complete revelation for us, who need God Himself. It was only by the Incarnation of God's Son that God's nature and love could be fully manifested. But this revealer of God came through Israel, and summed up Israel in Himself. He was also the sufferer for the world's sin, and thus achieved the other great purpose, which the prophet finds in the election of Israel. So God, Whose thoughts and ways are far above the thoughts and ways of man, brought to pass a grander and more satisfying fulfilment of this prophecy than the prophet himself had divined. We may still read these marvellous poems and feel that they have been realised and more than realised in Jesus of Nazareth.

The thoughts in this cycle of poems were so profound that they exercised much less influence than we should have anticipated on the later literature. The Servant of Yahweh is, however, probably the speaker in some of the Psalms, and this seems to be the case with the twenty-second Psalm, which may most conveniently be mentioned at this point. In

spite of the individualistic phraseology, we have probably to do with a collective body, that is, with Israel. There are several reminiscences of the Servant of Yahweh poems, and the thought of the conversion of the heathen is expressed, and apparently connected with the sufferer's deliverance. As nothing is said of sin as the cause of his suffering, it is remarkable that it should be treated as an inexplicable mystery and no reference be made to its vicarious character. It is possible that Cheyne (*Jewish Religious Life* p. 93. *Christian Use of the Psalms* p. 95) and Duhm are right in thinking that verses 22–31 are a late addition, but, on the whole, in spite of the change of tone and circumstances I incline to reject this view. The decision depends to some extent on the view we take of verse 21. If, as I think, the present text gives a finer sense, and is therefore more likely to be right, than the emendations which would restore a strict parallelism, then the transition from the deepest dejection and keenest pain is not altogether unmediated, since in verse 21 faith that God will deliver him gains the victory over the sufferer's despair.

The poem opens with an exceeding bitter cry. The uttermost evil has come on the sufferer. To suffer in the strength of God, with the assurance of His approval, is not to have touched the depths. That comes with the experience of desertion. And Israel is now treading that ninth circle of the Saint's Inferno. Yahweh has abandoned him, He is far

from his cry[39] and the words of his roaring. Yet Israel still cleaves fast to Him, and begins the invocation with the pathetic repetition "My God, my God." He cries by day and receives no answer, by night and obtains no relief. How strange that he should need to cry "Why hast Thou forsaken me?" that he should appeal for help in his extremity in vain! For Yahweh is the Holy One, pledged by His holiness to save His people. Nay more, He is enthroned on the praises of Israel[40], so that if these are silenced through Israel's destruction, Yahweh's exaltation by men comes to an end. Individuals may perish, and Yahweh's praise still go on as before, but if the nation dies, His service can no longer be maintained. The fathers trusted in Him, and He did not disappoint their trust, but when they cried

[39] The text reads, "from my salvation," *mīshu'āthī*. The versions translated the line "far from my salvation are the words of my roaring," and among modern scholars this is adopted by Baethgen. The meaning would be that the sufferer's cries are far from his Saviour, *i.e.*, Yahweh. The expression is rather unnatural, and the translation, "Being far from my salvation and the words of my roaring," yields a better sense. The Hebrew, however, is hardly what we should have expected, and it is better with Hitzig and several other scholars to make a very slight change in the text and read, *mishshaw'āthī*, "from my cry." Bickell, Cheyne and Duhm emend more radically.

[40] A beautiful transformation of the older thought of God as enthroned on the cherubim. I think the meaning of the passage which springs from its position in the context is that indicated above. But I must give myself the pleasure of quoting Prof. Cheyne's exquisite paraphrase in the Introduction to his Commentary: "These Spirit-taught utterances of the heart can like the 'throne-bearing' cherubim at any moment bring Him nigh."

to Him they were delivered. But now how different is the lot of their descendants. Israel is a mere worm,[41] the by-word of the heathen, exposed to their contempt.[42] Jeeringly the heathen say "Yahweh is his redeemer,[43] let Him rescue him; let Him deliver him, for He has pleasure in him." Yet from his earliest infancy[44] Yahweh had been his confidence and sustainer; let Him draw near, for

[41] The reference is to Isa. 41^{14}, "Fear not, thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel; I will help thee, saith Yahweh, and thy redeemer is the Holy One of Israel." There are other echoes of this passage in the Psalm.

[42] Cf. Isa. 53^{3}, 49^{7}.

[43] The text reads *gōl 'el Yahweh* "roll unto Yahweh." The meaning is thought to be Roll thy care on Yahweh. It is much better to accept Halévy's suggestion, which is adopted by Cheyne, *gō'ălō Yahweh* "his redeemer is Yahweh." The alteration is slight and the sense much improved. The point of the taunt is much sharper if the heathen are quoting Israel's own words, or the words of Yahweh about Israel, and it is common in the Second Isaiah to find Yahweh thus spoken of as Israel's *gō'ēl*. So in 41^{14}, the passage already mentioned, but also 43^{14}, $44^{6,24}$, 47^{4}, 48^{17}, $49^{7,26}$, $54^{5,8}$. We should also not forget the famous passage in Job, "I know that my *gō'ēl* liveth." The reference to the Servant in Isa. 40–55 is further emphasised by the closing words of the sentence, "He has pleasure in Him," which reminds us of Isa. 42^{1}, and, if Marti's reading in 53^{10} is correct, "But Yahweh had pleasure in His Servant," of that passage also.

[44] Here again there are references to the Servant in the Second Isaiah, 46^{3}, $44^{2,24}$, $49^{1,5}$. If, as some think, there is a reference to the custom of laying the new-born child before the father, that he might acknowledge it by taking it on his knees, or disown it by leaving it to lie, Duhm's suggestion that for *'ĕlī* "my God" we should read *'ābī* "my father" deserves consideration. Israel's sonship and Yahweh's fostering care in the infancy of the nation is a familiar thought in the Old Testament.

he is in peril and there is none to help. The sufferer now describes the attack of the heathen nations. They have hemmed him in like wild beasts, the dogs tear gaping wounds in his hands and feet.[45] His vital powers ebb away, his bones are wrenched out of joint, his heart fails him, his palate[46] is parched. He is drawing near to death, and it is Yahweh, Who is bringing him down to the dust of death. Behind the instrument He stands as the efficient cause. The victim is worn to a skeleton, his enemies gaze with delight on his suffering, and are so sure of his death, that they do not wait for it before they apportion his garments among them. Once more he urges

[45] Wellhausen's rearrangement, by which verse 16 follows on verse 12, seems a distinct improvement. The line translated in the E.V., "They pierced my hands and my feet," is in the Hebrew, as pointed, "Like a lion my hands and my feet." This is unintelligible, and even if we supply some such word as "they tore," it is not clear why hands and feet should be mentioned, as a lion does not select these for attack. The LXX., Vulgate and Syriac, read *ka'ārū* "they dug" instead of *ka'ărī* "like a lion." The passage should then be explained as above. The translation "they pierced" is unjustifiable. It is probably a case of fitting Old Testament language to what was supposed to be New Testament fulfilment. But the passage is not quoted in the New Testament, which does not, in fact, speak of the feet of Jesus as pierced, though such a reference is possible in Luke 24[39]. The best translation is "they have dug into my hands and feet." This is not quite natural, and possibly the text is corrupt. Wellhausen translates "my hands and feet like a lion," and thinks the line has no intelligible meaning here, and has come in by pure accident. If not original, verse 13 may be partly responsible for its insertion.

[46] The text reads *kōchī* "my strength," but we should, with many scholars, read *chikkī* "my palate," as much more suitable to the context.

Yahweh to come to his help, to deliver his life from the sword ; already he is in the lion's jaws, and prays to be delivered. He continues his prayer, "And from the horns of the wild oxen," but just as he is about to complete it, in a sudden inspiration of faith he soars into the triumphant assurance that God has heard him, and breaks off with the exclamation "Thou hast answered me."[47] It is now fitting that he should burst into praise for his deliverance, and this follows in the closing portion of the Psalm. The text is unfortunately not certain in some places, but for our purpose it is not necessary to follow the Psalm further in detail. The most important feature is that the deliverance of Israel has for its issue the conversion of the heathen.

The Psalm contributes nothing towards a solution of the problem. It has no hint to give, which would explain the mystery of Israel's dark experience. But it has its own value, in that it is a cry out of the depths, uttered by a people that in the bitterest trouble holds fast to God, even when the extreme pain befalls it of the hiding of God's face.

[47] We should have expected the couplet to be completed, "And from the horns of the wild-oxen do thou deliver me." The change from this to the unexpected assertion of deliverance, in our present text, is very fine and effective. Some, however, are not satisfied with it. Wellhausen, adopting a suggestion of Thrupp's, corrects *'ănīthānī* "thou hast answered me" into *'ănīvāthī*, which he translates "my miserable life." He thus gets as in 25^{16} a parallel to "my only one," which occurs in the last line of the preceding couplet. Duhm reads *'ozrēnī* "help me."

From this deep despondency springs an expression of thanksgiving for deliverance. It is not that deliverance has already come, but that faith has triumphed over the certainties of the world, and the apparent indifference of God. And in that marvellous assurance the sufferer, still ringed with relentless foes, with his life-blood ebbing away, and God seeming deaf to his cry, wins that serene confidence, which lifts him above his pain, above the certainty of impending death, and fills him with the sublime conviction that he shall yet live and declare the wonderful works of God. And with his faith there is joined a noble charity, too rare in the utterance of oppressed Psalmists. These heathen nations, that have well-nigh brought Israel to its death, stir within him no unholy passion for revenge. They are on the contrary to receive the lofty privilege of becoming Yahweh's worshippers. "All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto Yahweh; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee."

CHAPTER IV.

A Century of Disillusion.

THE Second Isaiah had painted in glowing colours the release of the Jews from captivity, their happy return to Palestine, with the privations of the march miraculously removed, the splendours of Zion, the brilliant future of the restored community. But the Jews did not respond to the privilege accorded them by Cyrus in 536 B.C., and but few abandoned their homes in the land, where they had so deeply struck their roots, to face the perils of the forgotten and desolate land of their fathers. The return to Palestine was never, indeed, within measurable distance of being accomplished, and prophets long cherished the ideal of a complete gathering to Canaan of all the Jews in the Dispersion. Those who returned soon found that the enchanting prospects, which had lured them to Zion, gave place to cruel disillusion. Bad harvests, drought, and the general wretchedness of their conditions quickly chilled their enthusiasm. They had come intending

to rebuild the temple. But they delayed, feeling that in their misery the time was not auspicious. The prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, urged them to the work, promising a happy change of fortune if they let Yahweh's house lie waste no longer. They traced their accumulated misfortunes to their neglect of Yahweh and preference of their own interests. When the prophets had secured the obedience of the community, and it was disheartened with the inferiority of the new temple to the old, they took up the promises of the second Isaiah, and predicted a splendid future. For soon Yahweh will convulse the earth, and in the crash of empires the Messianic age shall dawn, and the desirable things of the nations shall stream into Jerusalem. Thus the glory of the latter house shall be greater than the glory of the former. And for Zerubbabel an illustrious destiny is reserved: "In that day, saith Yahweh of hosts, will I take thee, O Zerubbabel my servant, the son of Shealtiel, saith Yahweh, and will make thee as a signet: for I have chosen thee saith Yahweh of hosts" (Hag. 2^{23}). It is probable that in the original text of Zech. 6^{9-15}, the prophet spoke of a command he had received to crown Zerubbabel.

The crash of the Persian empire was not, however, to come as yet. Its fall seemed not improbable, for in the year before Haggai and Zechariah came forward, almost the whole empire, though not Syria or Asia Minor, was in revolt. The insurrections

were suppressed, and the empire lasted for nearly two hundred years longer. It is an interesting question whether Zerubbabel was tempted to participate in a Messianic revolt, and lost his position or even his life in consequence. That his later history is quite unknown to us suggests that he may have fallen into disfavour at the Persian court, though even his deposition and still more his execution, perhaps by crucifixion, remains at best a conjecture. Its interest for us lies partly in the deepening of the gloom in Judah and the reaction from the Messianic hopes which the contemporary prophets had so brightly portrayed, partly in the suggestion that Zerubbabel is the suffering servant of Isa. 52^{13}—53^{12} which has been recently revived by Sellin and Kittel, though the former of these has still more recently withdrawn his name in favour of Jehoiachin. It is unnecessary for me to discuss it, since the view is excluded if I am right in thinking that the Servant is not an individual but the nation.

Before leaving Zechariah, I must refer to the remarkable passage with which the third chapter of his prophecy opens. Joshua the high priest is standing before Yahweh in filthy garments, and at his right hand stands the Satan to contest his plea. The thought is probably that the high priest's filthy garments symbolise the sin of the community of which he is the representative; though not sin which still remains to be atoned for, since otherwise

Yahweh could hardly have implied by His rebuke to the Satan that the accusation he was urging against Joshua was unjust. In the fact of its misery the Satan, who here expresses the judgment of the traditional theology, sees an evidence of its guilt, and thus disputes the standing of its representative before God. This is a reflection of the view that the people must have taken of their misfortunes. They argued, we are wretched, therefore Yahweh is angry with us for our sin. They doubted whether God would renew His favour, or, as the prophet would say, whether the Satan would establish his case against them before God. The vision corrects this misgiving. Had the Satan won his case, the miseries of Judah would have continued. But Yahweh decides against him and rebukes him. He has plucked Jerusalem as a brand from the burning. In other words, He considers that Jerusalem has been in the fires of affliction long enough, and therefore has Himself intervened to snatch it from the flames. Since its punishment is sufficient, it will not be afflicted any more. This is symbolised by the removal of Joshua's filthy clothing, that is the sin of the people, and the clothing of him in rich apparel.

There is here no advance on the traditional view in the solution of the problem. Suffering is still regarded as the punishment of sin. All that the prophet urges in correction of popular misapprehension is that present suffering does not prove Yahweh's

present anger. The wrath may have really passed away, and grace be on the point of bursting from behind the clouds. The emergence in this passage of the figure of the Satan is interesting both in itself and on account of his re-appearance in Job. It is thought by some that Zechariah is responsible for his introduction into Jewish thought. But this is dubious; quite apart from all questions touching the literary origin of the Prologue of Job, and its dependence on popular tradition, we should have expected a much fuller description, if Zechariah had first created the figure. He seems to assume that his readers will know quite well of whom he is speaking. It is unfortunate that both here and in Job the later employment of the word as a proper name of the devil, should have led to the strange thought that the devil was intended in these passages. The Satan is one of the sons of God, in other words, belongs to the order of Elohim, is the zealous servant who exists to do Yahweh's will. His function, apart from which he has no significance, is to oppose man's claim to righteousness before God, by dragging all his sin to the light. It is not his duty to find any good in man, presumably that function was exercised by another member of his order. His duty was to detect whatever evil lurked secretly or in subtle disguise in man's heart or life, and with this evidence withstand man's claims to Divine acceptance. The whole-hearted zeal, with which he flung himself into his work, naturally gave an unfavourable impression

of his character, which prepared the way for the later associations of the name. The cold-blooded cruelty from which he does not shrink, that he may make good his case, is one of the most striking features foreshadowing the subsequent development. So far as our special subject is concerned he has much less importance in Zechariah than in Job. He represents one side of God's dealings with men, that of strict and exacting severity, and lays himself open to God's rebuke, because he can occupy that point of view alone, and allows nothing for the modification of justice by grace. As a specialist he naturally exaggerates the worth of his criteria. In another respect he has an interest for our problem, so far as the doctrine anticipates later solutions which assigned some share in man's misery to hostile supernatural powers.

The bright hopes of independence, of national prosperity and a Davidic king were not to be fulfilled. The history of the community for the next sixty years is unknown to us. But we may infer that matters had not much improved. In the prophecy of Malachi, which we may perhaps best date about 460 B.C., we are confronted with serious moral and religious disorders. The old days of oppression seemed to have returned, and an attitude was assumed to the problem of suffering similar to what we find in Job, though, of course, in a much more superficial form. There was a deep scepticism as to Yahweh's moral government. The prophet

quotes a current saying: "Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of Yahweh, and He delighteth in them" (2^{17}). Even the pious had given way to despondency: "It is in vain to serve God, and what profit is it that we have kept His charge, and that we have walked mournfully before Yahweh of Hosts? And now we call the proud happy; yea, they that work wickedness are built up; yea, they tempt God and are delivered." There is no solution, but simply a reproof for wearying God and uttering stout words against Him, and a prediction that the day of Yahweh is soon coming, when the wicked will be punished and the God-fearing will be spared, and the difference will be clearly seen between the righteous and the evil-doers.

A few years later, in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, we may place the greater part of Isa. 56–66. It is hard to believe that Duhm and Marti are right in assigning the whole of these eleven chapters to a single hand. It is a strain on our natural disinclination to analysis when we find the levels in its various parts so different. Can the author of 60–62 have written anything else in these chapters? Moreover, 63^{7}–64^{12} surely cannot in the face of 64^{11} have been written in the age of Nehemiah, when a temple was actually in existence; Duhm's reply, that this temple is passed over as unworthy of mention in comparison with Solomon's, being very unsatisfactory. It would be simplest to date it during the exile, while the first temple lay in ashes, and the second had not risen on

its site, were it not for the words, "Thy holy people possessed it but a little while." If we could confidently accept Robertson Smith's theory that the Elohistic Psalms, usually supposed to spring from the darkest period of the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes, really belonged to the time of Artaxerxes Ochus, about the middle of the fourth century, it would be natural to follow Cheyne in assigning this section to the same time. If, in the silence of history, this be thought too precarious, we should do better to revert to an exilic date, rather than bring it down to the Maccabean period. With this exception, however, it is probable that the whole of Isa. 56–66 belongs to the age of Nehemiah. But while these chapters cast a welcome light on the material welfare of the people and their religious, moral, and social condition, they say little that is of value for our purpose. But they confirm the impression, already derived from Malachi, of the disillusion that prevailed towards the end of a century, which opened with such dazzling prospects. The community, whose glorious destiny the Second Isaiah had foretold with such rapturous eloquence, was as far from attaining it as could well be imagined. All the evils which the old prophets had denounced seemed to fester in it, and fully explained the misfortunes by which it was overwhelmed. The rulers are greedy and drunken. There is a zealous religionism, which finds expression in fasting, but which is unavailing in God's sight. For while they

sit in sackcloth and ashes with bowed heads, they fast for strife and to smite with the fist of wickedness, and oppress their labourers. They wonder that Yahweh is so indifferent to their ascetic exercises in His honour. Why do they suffer, seeing that they are so religious? "Wherefore have we fasted and Thou seest not? afflicted our soul and Thou takest no knowledge?" In noble indignation the prophet bids them loose the bonds of wickedness, let the oppressed go free, break every yoke, feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and shelter the poor. Such is the fast in which Yahweh delights; this will make their voice heard on high, and cause their light to shine forth gloriously. Judah's misery presents no inexplicable problem. It is not because Yahweh's arm is shortened so that He cannot save His people, or His ear heavy so that He cannot hear their cry. But their sins of lying, maladministration of justice, and bloodshed have separated Him from them.

Yet in spite of disenchanting failure, these prophets do not let themselves be discouraged. Especially in the magnificent chapters 60–62 do we find a wealth of gorgeous detail setting forth the splendour of the Zion that is to be. The exiles will return from the Dispersion, the nations will be drawn to Jerusalem by the supernatural light that streams from it and do menial service for Israel. They will send their wealth to adorn the temple and their flocks to smoke on its altar. Yet while the prophet cannot hold his peace, and bids the angel

watchers give Yahweh no rest till He make Jerusalem a praise in the earth, and while he proclaims the certainty of Zion's salvation, he is conscious that this bright day may dawn less soon than he hopes: "I, Yahweh, will hasten it in its time."

CHAPTER V.

The Problem in Job.[1]

IT was perhaps as the fifth century was slipping into the past that the poet, whose genius made him the peer of the most gifted of our race, wrote his mighty work. But while it may take some of its colour from the dark experience of its time, it really contributes little to our understanding of it to connect it closely with any set of historical conditions. It is not with the nation that the poet is concerned, but with the individual, not with Israel but with man, not with God's discipline of His

[1] For a statement of the grounds on which my critical conclusions, which are substantially those generally accepted, rest, I must refer to my forthcoming Commentary on Job in *The Century Bible*. Here I merely summarise the conclusions. The original work consisted of the Prologue, the dialogue between Job and his friends, the speeches of Yahweh and the Epilogue. The Prologue and the Epilogue may have been borrowed in whole or part from an earlier work, but are not later additions to the poem. 27^{7-23} may be a later addition, but is in any case not part of Job's speech, and if retained must be largely assigned to one of the friends. The speeches of Elihu, ch. 28, and the descriptions of behemoth and leviathan, are later additions.

people, but with His government of the world. Of the author we know nothing save what we can glean from the work. He had passed through the most agonising doubts, had faced without flinching the suffering of mankind, and had fought his way to peace.

He takes for his subject an old popular story, which may have existed already in literary form. His hero is a man eminent for his wealth and still more so for his piety. All men see in him the favourite of heaven, and he himself lives in the consciousness of unbroken communion with God. Now the Satan, whose function was to detect the evil that lurked beneath the show of virtue, has in the zealous discharge of his duty found that apparent virtue is so often the disguise of vice, that he has become the victim of a cynicism too hardened to admit that any man can really be virtuous unless God makes it worth his while. To turn His zealous servant from so unjust an estimate, Yahweh challenges his cynicism with the case of Job. The Satan is ready with his reply. He had left no stone unturned to unmask piety so conspicuous, and had been forced to admit the genuineness of Job's virtue. But, granted that Job is no hypocrite, is his virtue worth anything after all? Who would not be virtuous, when virtue paid so well? So the Satan meets Yahweh's challenge with another. Strip Job of his wealth and bereave him of his children, and he will fawn on Yahweh no longer,

but curse Him to His face. So, with Yahweh's permission, Job by a series of appalling catastrophes is robbed in one day of property and children. Yet he disappoints his adversary by submitting in beautiful resignation to the will of heaven, which as it gives, so also can take away. Foiled in his first attempt, the Satan is at no loss for a reason. With the colloquial freedom of an old servant, he tells Yahweh that a man's own skin is his main concern, if possessions and family go, he may reckon himself not so badly off, if he keeps his own skin whole. Once more with Yahweh's permission, the untiring sceptic seeks to force curses from Job's lips by racking him with an intolerable disease. But nobly patient, the sufferer meets his wife's suggestion of revolt with one of the classical utterances of resignation: "Good shall we receive at the hand of God, and evil shall we not receive?" So Job comes triumphantly out of his trials, and Yahweh's confidence in his Servant's goodness is magnificently vindicated.

Yet while he holds by his piety and utters from his heart the language of resignation, the calamity that crushed him was an inexplicable mystery. The teaching of his day regarded great misfortune as a sign of great sin, and an evidence of the anger of God. Yet he was so conscious of his own uprightness, so sure moreover of God's favour, that he could not all at once apply his theology to his own tragic change of fortune. It is clear that as the logic of

the situation developed, it would be more likely to shake his faith in God than in his own integrity. For the latter was certified to him by his own immediate consciousness, whereas the former was guaranteed only by the traditional orthodoxy, and his past experience. And this past experience did not prove God's goodness, it suggested it, indeed, but, after all, the happiness he had enjoyed might only have masked some sinister design. What if God had planned the catastrophe from the first, and to make it the more bitter had set him for long years serenely on the pinnacle of bliss, caressed by His sunshine and confident in His smile? As he brooded, till the weeks stretched into months, on the strange fate that had surprised him, the doubt of God's goodness must have stolen into his mind. Though he would banish it as blasphemy, it must have forced its way back as often as he repelled it. For, on the facts before him, what other solution could present itself to one trained to regard great suffering as branding its victim with the curse of God? Sure of his own innocence, what can he say but this, that the God who smites the innocent with His curse, must Himself be immoral? This, then, is Job's problem, and with its emergence the centre of interest shifts from the trial to which the Satan has exposed him, to the conflict within his own soul. It is just the deep piety of Job that makes the struggle so intense, nay so terrific. A man, fitted beyond most to find his happiness in the love

of God, feeling that his confidence in God's righteousness is shattered, we see him driven on till he defies God because he must be true to himself. Such is the sublime spectacle the poet has dared to show us: a weak man, strong in the justice of his cause, rebuking the Almighty to His face for His immoral government of the world. It is all the more sublime that Job is no Stoic. He does not proudly despise his pain, nor in haughty self-esteem count himself the equal of the gods. A driven leaf, a fleeting shadow, quailing before God's majesty, quivering in agony at the touch of pain, how lofty the moral courage that impels him to confront God, with nothing but his own rectitude and his burning hatred of wrong, to dare a sharper torture, if he may but assert the truth.

Job maintains his calm dignity till three of his friends come to console him. After uttering their lamentations over the sufferer, they sit in silence for seven days with him, for when grief is so crushing what can sympathy do but be silent? Unmanned at last, Job breaks the stillness with a bitter complaint, cursing the day of his birth, and longing that he may die. This leads on to a dialogue between himself and the friends. They firmly hold that great suffering is to be explained by great sinfulness, and since Job's consciousness of integrity is incommunicable, it is natural that they should sacrifice their friend to their theology. They deal gently with him at the first, but with each cycle of speeches the

debate grows more and more embittered. The speeches of the friends have little significance for our problem. They start from the assumption that omnipotence must be righteous. Perishable man cannot be just before God. Not only is He the Almighty Creator, in whose sight the loftiest creatures are unclean, but He is the All-Wise, whose ways baffle the keenest scrutiny of man. What He does must be right; the Almighty cannot pervert justice. Why, indeed, should He? since He is too great for man's righteousness to be any pleasure or gain to Him. Much of the friend's speeches consists of descriptions of God's judgments on the wicked. To Job himself they try to be considerate, though as the debate proceeds the strain on their forbearance becomes increasingly severe. Eliphaz comforts Job by reminding him how blessed is the man whom God chastens. Yet all are convinced that the facts point to Job's sin as the cause of his suffering, hence they urge him to turn to God, and generally bring their speeches to an end with a glowing picture of the happiness that will then round off his days. And while they also dwell on the fate of the godless, to make good their argument and point a moral for Job, yet their treatment of him, though it varies with different speakers, is as tender as we could have expected, with their theological presuppositions. Essentially the standpoint in the speeches of Elihu is identical with that of the friends. These speeches do not belong to the original work.

It is not their accusations that provoke the anger of Job so much as their vacant platitudes, their superficial maxims, their sorry attempts to solve new problems by obsolete methods, their blind pedantic orthodoxy. Surely, were they not bemused with a theology out of touch with life, they would catch the ring of sincerity in his voice, and brush aside the unworthy thought of secret sin adequate to so terrible a punishment. Their arguments fill him with scorn and irritation, but their unkindness wounds him to the quick. He had counted on their sympathy, but had been disappointed, as caravans perish from thirst, since the streams they had reckoned on are dry. At times he even appeals to their pity: "Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends; For the hand of God hath touched me." But more often he crumples them with his scorn, and renews his contention with God.

It is in his debate with God that the interest of Job's speeches is most intense. He charges God, sometimes in language of tremendous realism, with inflicting his intolerable pains. His are the poisoned arrows that have consumed his strength. It is God Who assails him like a giant, and dashes him in pieces, God Who cruelly persecutes him, breaks him with a tempest and dissolves him in the storm. It is God's terrors that dismay him, His presence that troubles him, the horrible dreams which He sends that affright him. So with the Almighty for his enemy,

he is driven to bay, and turns on God with the plain speech of the desperate :

> Therefore I will not refrain my mouth ;
> I will speak in the anguish of my spirit ;
> I will complain in the bitterness of my soul. (7^{11})
>
> My soul is weary of my life ;
> I will give free course to my complaint ;
> I will speak in the bitterness of my soul (10^{1})
> Hold your peace, let me alone, that I may speak,
> And let come on me what will. (13^{11}).

The friends have made eloquent speeches about the might and majesty of God, His inscrutable wisdom and the mystery of His ways. But Job is well aware of it all, nay he himself does not lag behind the friends in his descriptions of it. But this only makes matters worse. There can be no immorality like that of omnipotence and omniscience uncontrolled by goodness. Such Job feels to be the Immorality Who governs the universe.

> Perfect and wicked He destroys.
> If the scourge slay suddenly,
> At the trial of the innocent He mocks.
> The earth is given into the hand of the wicked,
> The faces of its judges He covereth ;
> If not, then who is it ? (9^{23-24}).

Of the prosperity of the wicked Job cites abund-

ance of proofs. Sometimes he speaks as if God were simply indifferent to moral distinctions, slaying good and bad without discrimination. At other times he speaks as if God directly favoured the wicked. The difference is largely one of mood and expression, the thought he means to utter is that the government of the world is radically immoral. No destiny controls God's actions, He is free with a sovereign freedom in the colossal wrongs He permits Himself to do. His actions are arbitrary, and it is just the incalculable waywardness of His dealings with man that strikes such terror into the heart.

Not observation, but his own calamity, revealed to Job the profound injustice of God. Maddened by his pain, goaded by the cruel judgment of his friends, the hostility of God, at first so perplexing to him, comes at last to seem only too characteristic. His own misery sharpens his insight into the misery of the world. Yet he is preoccupied far more with the issues between himself and God, than with God's relations to mankind. From the first he had been predestined in God's secret counsel to his cruel fate. His long and prosperous career had all been part of God's sinister design. With fiendish malignity He had lulled His servant into security and a sense of His loving care, that He might dash him into a misery, made unspeakably more wretched by its contrast with his happiness, and by the stripping of the mask of love from God's

hate. And now his Adversary is determined to establish his guilt. He knows that Job is innocent, yet He is the Almighty, Who can easily put him in the wrong. What chance has a frail ignorant man against a Deity, Who can entrap him so easily by His subtle questions into self-condemnation, or Who by the sheer terror of His majesty can strike him dumb or force him into confession of sin ? He skulks behind the veil ; will neither listen nor reply. If He respects so far the decencies of justice that He justifies His action by real sins of Job, He can do it only by raking up the long dead past, and dragging to light the sins of his youth, when passion was unchecked by mature experience and judgment. But He has no magnanimity. He spies on man's minutest actions, will not for a moment release him from His maddening watchfulness. How petty must be His character, since He follows frail man with persecution so untiring.

> What is man that Thou magnifiest him,
> And settest Thy heart upon him ;
> And visitest him every morning,
> And every moment dost test him ? ($7^{17, 18}$).

Even granted that he had sinned, his sin cannot hurt the Almighty. Is a puny man so formidable that God dare not relax His vigilance ? If Job were the tossing tumultuous sea, conquered by God in primaeval times, but still chafing against the

restraints He imposed upon it, and flinging upward its heaven-assaulting waves, then he might be a menace to God. How fitly matched with that mighty conquest of the chaos monster, is the miracle which has subdued a weak mortal man!

In all the surging turmoil of Job's soul one thing stands fast, the certainty of his own integrity. He affirms it again and again, he is a just, a blameless man, there is no violence in his hands and his prayer is pure. He is sure that God knows that he is not wicked, and though He has determined to slay him, he will maintain his ways before Him. His righteousness he holds fast and will not let it go. This consciousness finds its noblest expression in Job's great defence of his past life, which perhaps touches the loftiest point of Old Testament ethics. Sure of himself and the justice of his cause, he brings his self-vindication to its close, with a challenge to God that He should answer him, and the proud declaration that as prince he would draw near to God, bearing the indictment which his adversary had written.

Yet the poet has wonderfully shown us the clashing currents in Job's breast by the strange incoherence of his language about God. He is torn between the bitter present, and the happy memory, between the God Who is torturing him, and the God, of Whose goodness he had drunk so deeply in the past. And side by side with all his incisive complaints of God's cruelty, and scorn of His malignant pettiness, side by

side even with the firm assertion of His immorality, stand other utterances which recognise His righteousness. He bases the confidence he expresses in one of his less gloomy moments, on the conviction that a godless man shall not come before Him. He warns the friends that God will not suffer Himself to be flattered by lies. It is therefore natural that appeal should alternate with invective. The appeal is in some cases, indeed, rather remonstrance. Why had God suffered him to be born? Why does He contend with him, why hide His face? What are the sins God has to bring against him? Is it good for Him to despise His own work, or, when He has lavished so much care on fashioning His servant, wantonly to destroy him? But the tone of remonstrance is softened into the tone of pathetic appeal. Would that he knew where he might find Him, that he might lay bare his case or utter his supplication. From the injustice of man he turns to God, in the moving words: "My friends scorn me, but my eye pours out tears unto God." If he could only come face to face with God, He would not contend with him in the greatness of His power, but would give heed to his plea. He appeals to God to relax His incessant watchfulness, and give him a respite from his pain. Would that He might hide him in Sheol, keep him in secret till His wrath were past. Here the poet advances to one of his deepest thoughts. Not only does Job appeal from man to God, but he appeals from God to God. There seems to be an

irrational element in his thought. Job asks God to save him from God's wrath, to place him out of its reach, till it has spent itself. He appeals to God against God, as if God had a higher and a lower self. Behind the wrathful he catches a glimpse of the gracious God. There is no umpire between them, but would not God Himself give security to God for Job? So he wins, if he cannot hold fast, the conviction, that his witness is in heaven, and He that vouches for him is on high. This reaches its climax in the famous passage 19^{25-27}, in which Job expresses his conviction that his vindicator lives, and that his innocence will at last be established. And though he does not look forward to a vindication in his lifetime, yet he believes that he will be permitted to know that his character is cleared. Not that he anticipates a happy immortality, or escape from Sheol's dismal gloom. He prizes his honour and fair fame above his happiness, and with the vision of God as his avenger he will be content.

The schism in God, which seems so strange, is a reflection of the schism in Job's experience. His mind swings to and fro between the memory of blessed fellowship and the pang of his present curse. When his pain is hard to bear, or he is stung by the calm injustice of his friends, he can think of God only as his unrelenting foe. But as the thought of his former life in God's favour fills his soul, he turns back with yearning and tenderness to those happy days, when God watched over him in love, and he

walked through the darkness in His light, when he called upon Him and He answered him. Still his own heart goes out to God, how gladly he would renew the old communion. And though the anger of God now hotly pursues him, he feels that it will not last. It is only a temporary aberration that has seized Him, not, as Job elsewhere affirms, a long cherished and subtly framed design to which He is giving effect. If He would only hide him in Sheol, forget him till His anger had burned out, and then remember him, how gladly he would wait the full time in that dreary home, so that he might at last renew the happy intercourse, forgetting God's wayward mood. But this hope he sadly sets aside. There can be few things more pathetic in all literature than his appeal to God to be gracious to him before it is too late. Soon he must die, and when God's inexplicable wrath has spent itself, He will think remorsefully of His servant whose loyal love He has so cruelly spurned. And He will think on him in love, and long for the familiar intercourse. But His vain regrets will come too late, Job will have passed beyond recall:

"For now I shall lie down in the dust,
And Thou shalt seek me diligently and I shall not be." (7^{21})

Again and again Job had challenged God to appear and defend His action. He had implored

Him to fulfil two conditions, to suspend the persecution from which he was suffering and not to overwhelm him with the dread of His presence :

" Only do not two things unto me,
Then will I not hide myself from Thy face :
Withdraw Thine hand far from me ;
And let not Thy terror make me afraid.
Then call Thou, and I will answer ;
Or let me speak and answer Thou me." (13^{20-22} cf. 9^{34-35})

But God fulfils neither of Job's conditions. When He appears, He does not take His rod from the sufferer, and He speaks out of the whirlwind. Moreover, not only does He leave Job on the rack and appal him with the storm, but He deigns to give no reply to Job's questions, no defence of His own conduct. Rather He speaks roughly to the sufferer, pressing him with questions, which convict him of his ignorance. The reader is at first distracted between his wonder at the poet's genius and his disappointment and even resentment at the character of Yahweh's reply. Surely, he thinks, God will now make clear the mystery, but no word is said to explain to Job why he suffers. There is no comfort offered him, but what seems like a brutal mockery. Yet if we look more closely we shall see that the speeches of Yahweh are not mere irrelevant irony. Job has taken on himself to criticise the government

of the universe. But has he ever realised what the universe is, or how complex the problem of its control? So God brings before him its wonderful phenomena in language of surpassing beauty. The mighty work of its creation, the curbing of the rebellious sea, the land of the dead, the home of light and of darkness, the ordered march of the constellations, the treasuries of snow and hail, which God has stored to overwhelm His enemies; the frost that binds the streams, or the rain that quenches the desert's thirst, all pass before Job's mind and all are too vast, too obscure, for him to comprehend. Then God sketches a series of swift pictures of His animal creation, of whose secrets Job is profoundly ignorant. Thus He brings home to him the limitation of his outlook, thus Job comes to learn the wide range of God's interests. And as we reflect more deeply we see a relevance in the Divine speeches that at first we are apt to miss. Job's language had not stopped short of blasphemy, and though he pleaded that his friends must not take too seriously the words of a desperate man, yet he deserved a sharp lesson to cure his presumption. True, he had freely confessed God's might and wisdom, he had beforehand said that God would not contend with him in the greatness of His power. But he needed to have the detail bitten into his imagination, that the vague generality might become vivid and concrete. For much of the mischief with Job lay in his self-absorption. He dwells on God's immoral control of the

lot of man, but even more specially on God's immoral treatment of himself. God bids the self-centred sufferer look away at the wide universe, then he will come to a juster estimate of man's place. But even if he looks at the sentient life of the world, he will realise that man is only one among many of the objects of God's concern. All those glorious pictures of the animal creation that God flashes before his eyes, are meant to show him that man's importance may easily be overrated. Especially is this the case with those unsubdued denizens of the wilderness, who live their life wholly independent of man. There, too, God sends the fertilising shower, causing it "to rain on a land where no man is."

When Job confesses that he has sinned in speaking of things too wonderful for him, and with self-abhorrence repents in dust and ashes, the question arises whether we are to see in this a verification of his dread that the terror of God's majesty and His insoluble questions would force him into self-condemnation. It would be to miss the deepest teaching the poet has to give us, were we to think so. By confronting him with Nature, God has taken him out of himself, and convinced him of his relative insignificance. Yet even that is not the chief thing. It is no accident that the poet refrains from putting in God's mouth any explanation of Job's sufferings. To men oppressed by the mystery of their own or the world's pain, the explanation of an individual case is of little worth, unless it admits of wider

application. And for Job himself the explanation is unneeded. He has received a new experience :

> " I had heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear ;
> But now mine eye seeth Thee,
> Wherefor I abhor myself, and repent
> In dust and ashes." ($42^{5,6}$).

It is the vision of God, which has released him from his problem. His suffering is as mysterious as ever, but plain or mysterious, why should it vex him any longer ? He has seen God, and has entered into rest. The only answer we can get to the problem of pain, is, the poet would tell us, this answer. The soul's certainty is the soul's secret. The spirit has escaped its difficulties by soaring above them. If we know God, no other knowledge matters. For ourselves we have won our way to unspeakable peace. As we dwell in the secret place of the Most High and abide under the shadow of the Almighty, we see the universe from a new point of view. We can give no answer to its questions, no solution of its baffling riddles. But since we know God we can trust Him to the uttermost ; we know, incredible though it may seem, that the world's misery does not contradict the love of God. It was therefore with deliberate intent that the poet put in God's lips no hint of the reason of Job's suffering. To trust God when we understand Him would be but a sorry triumph for religion. To trust God,

when we have every reason for distrusting Him, save our inward certainty of Him, is the supreme victory of religion. This is the victory which Job achieves. But he can achieve it only as God takes the initiative and gives him the revelation of Himself.

Yet God by the very action He took at the Satan's instigation, placed not Job only, but Himself on His trial. If the Satan is to be convinced that Job's piety is disinterested, it must be through the tests that he imposes. For God to accept the challenge meant that He accepted a grave responsibility. Job has to be the involuntary subject of this experiment, he must suffer that God's confidence may be justified. To some at any rate this will not seem a complete vindication of God's action, it, too, must go with other partially-solved mysteries. The difficulty would probably be less to a Semite than to ourselves. Yet the author felt it, and for that reason added or retained the Epilogue. It is not that Job needed his restoration, in order to regain his confidence in God. Had he been doomed to end his days in pain, he could walk through the valley in the memory of the vision of God. But then the reader would have been very unfavourably impressed by God's treatment of him. Now he feels that God has made amends to His loyal servant for the pain He has made him endure. To estimate the Epilogue aright we must not forget that the author had to keep the treatment of his subject within the limits of the earthly life, and could not work with the conception

of a happy immortality. And we must remember that the compensation given to Job is to clear God's character, not in any way to re-affirm the old theory that the righteous must be fortunate.

What lessons then has the book for ourselves? It bids us in the first place be resolute in facing the facts. To flatter God by timidly denying their existence, is to do Him no service, but only to draw down His anger (13^{7-11}, $42^{7,8}$). To smother them is to leave doubt lurking unquietly in the heart, to recognise them may be the path to peace. The next lesson is that we cannot argue for the invariable connexion of sin and suffering, or of righteousness and prosperity. We ought, on the contrary, to be prepared to find in many cases that the wicked prosper, while the righteous are doomed to pain. Further, suffering may be sent to test the reality of our piety, and its freedom from the vice of self-interest. Once more we are bidden to remember that man is not the exclusive object of God's regard, and that he is just one member of a very complex organism. It is given him to see only a small section of the universe, he cannot pass judgment on the whole from his knowledge of so tiny a part. The most important lesson is that even though no speculative solution be possible to us, we may so know God as to be sure of His love, and be content to suffer without understanding or caring to understand the reason. Such an attitude is not one of resignation or acquiescence, but of glad acceptance,

because we are assured of the love that sends the sorrow. There is, moreover, one very important contribution which the poet does not make, but which I am inclined to think, he meant to suggest. He could not work confidently with the conception of immortality. But he was clearly tempted by it, and seems to look for light from it. Let it be noticed in what gloomy colours he paints Sheol. From it there is no return, it is a land of darkness and the shadow of death, of darkness so dense that its very light is as darkness. While the tree may be cut down and yet bud at the scent of water, man is never wakened from the sleep of death. Job's words are so strong that it is hard to suppress the feeling that the poet intended to force revulsion. And the thought of a return to life is definitely before him. Probably he can do no more than turn wistfully towards it, feeling it almost too good to be true. It may seem strange that no reference is made to the vicarious character of suffering, if, as I have assumed, the poem is later than the Servant passages in the Book of Isaiah. Probably we should account for this by the fact that the author of the latter was dealing with the suffering of the nation, whereas the author of Job was concerned with the problem of individual suffering.

CHAPTER VI.

Songs in the Night.

IT is no part of my plan to discuss those passages in the Old Testament, that connect the suffering, of which they speak, with the sin of the sufferer. Under this head a large number of passages in the Psalter falls. Yet there are many which treat the suffering endured by the community, the godly, or the individual Psalmist as a mystery. They are cries out of the depths, their constant burden is "How long?" It is not necessary, however, to do much more than give a brief summary, since for the most part the writers do not get beyond complaint, and the prayer for deliverance. Little short of half the Psalms contain mournful appeals to God for salvation from pain or oppression. It is often far from clear whether it is an individual or the community that is speaking, and the historical conditions which the Psalms presuppose are frequently known to us only in the most general way. In some cases it is a heathen enemy, which is trampling on Israel, in other cases it is the lax, irreligious Jews who oppress their pious countrymen, in others the individual writer

who suffers at the hands of some enemy. With the despair and self-pity there are mingled bitter curses on the oppressor. We may palliate them by the consideration that the Psalmists identified their cause with the cause of God, and by assuming that often the community and not an individual is the sufferer. But it is one of the numerous signs in the religion of Israel, how much there was needed the coming of One who should pray "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The causes of their affliction, apart from their own sin, are variously enumerated. It may be the sins of their forefathers, as in Psa. 79[8], "Remember not against us the sins of our ancestors." It may be Yahweh's anger, for which no motive can be assigned, the anger itself being simply inferred from the consequences it has involved. Or again, it may be Yahweh's indifference. He has cast off His people. Thus in the dark days of dishonour and defeat, when God no longer went forth with the Jewish hosts, and made His people a derision to the heathen, it is not in their own sin that they find the reason, for they have not forgotten God, or dealt falsely in His covenant. So far from that, it is their very loyalty to God, which has brought disaster upon them :

"Nay, but for Thy sake are we killed all the day long,
We are counted as sheep for the slaughter." (Psa. 44[22])

It can only be that God has lapsed into forget-

fulness of His people. He is as one who sleeps, unconscious of the tragedy that He ought to stay. Hence the Psalmist seeks to stir Him from His sluggish indolence with the impassioned cry :

" Rouse thyself ! Why sleepest thou, O Lord ?
Awake, cast us not off for ever."

In Psa. 92 [6], we have an interesting passage, probably referring to some recent event, in which it is said to be a mystery unknown to the senseless, that it is part of God's plan, for the wicked to flourish in order that they might be destroyed. Twice we have remarkable references to " the gods" as responsible for the wrongs that are rampant on earth. To these " Elohim " Yahweh, according to Deut. 32 [8], had allotted the heathen nations, while He retained Israel as His own portion. They are identical with " the host of the high ones on high " of whom we read in Isa. 24 [21], and with the angel princes in the Book of Daniel. Like the angels of the churches in the Revelation, they are held responsible for the actions of those committed to them. The situation in Pss. 58, 82, is one of misery for Israel caused by the violence of the heathen. For this violence the heavenly patrons are held guilty, so when, as in Job, they come to present themselves before Yahweh, He reproves them for the injustice of their rule, and threatens them with the punishment of death :

"I said, Ye are gods;
And all of you sons of the Most High.
Howbeit, ye shall die like men,
And fall like one of the princes" (Psa. 82 [6]).

There are three Psalms which deal specifically with our problem, Pss. 37, 49, 73. The first of these is an alphabetical Psalm, and we are therefore prepared to find considerable repetition, and no strict development of the thought. The author rebukes complaints against God on account of the prosperity of the wicked, and bids his readers be not envious of them. Rather let them wait patiently on Yahweh, for if they delight in Him, He will give them their heart's desire, and make their righteousness go forth as the light. Vexation at the success of the godless, leads only to evil doing. Why indeed should they nourish vexation? The wicked plot the death of the righteous, but Yahweh mocks, for it is their own death that is coming. Soon the judgment is to burst, when they will be rooted out of the land, and vanish like smoke. Those that are cursed of Him shall be cut off. But the humble, who wait on Yahweh, shall inherit the land for ever, and have delight in abundance of peace. Better then to have little like the righteous rather than the wealth of the wicked. And even under present conditions, the righteous man and his children do not come to want. Moreover, even before the judgment on the wicked comes, examples are to be seen

of the unrighteous flourishing like the cedars of Lebanon, but suddenly cut off. Probably there is no reference to the after life in verses 37, 38, though it is uncertain whether the meaning is that there is a posterity or a future to the man of peace, but not to the wicked. The Psalm would have been in place in the Book of Proverbs, it is deservedly a favourite for devotional reading, but it does not advance the solution of the problem.

Psa. 49 is much more striking. The author propounds the question why he should fear in time of calamity, when the wealthy seek to overthrow him. No man can ransom himself[1] from Sheol, or secure for himself an earthly immortality. Wise and fool die alike. The grave[2] is their house for ever and man perishes like the beasts. Death drives the self-confident down to Sheol, as a shepherd drives his flock, while the upright rule over them in the morning[3]. But the Psalmist expresses the confidence that God will ransom him from Sheol and take him. Therefore there is no need for fear, when a man

[1] The text reads, "No man can by any means ransom a brother." But "ransom himself" is the sense required. The word for "brother" *āch* is also placed in a strange position at the beginning of the sentence. We should read *ak* "surely," or "but."

[2] The text reads *qirbām* "their inward part." But this yields no proper sense, "their inward part their houses for ever." We should read with the LXX., Syriac, Vulgate and Targum *qibrām* "their grave," or perhaps better still point *qᵉbārīm* "graves."

[3] The sense is not at all clear. "In the morning" rather takes us into Apocalyptic; when the great world-judgment breaks, then the upright will rule over the wicked. But it scarcely seems suitable here,

grows rich, for at death he must leave his riches behind him.

Here the author does not appeal, as the author of Psa. 37, to an imminent catastrophe, but to life's normal issue. All die, and no man will ever be so rich as to bribe God to release him from the universal fate. But is a commonplace of this kind worthy of the introduction, in which the author invites all nations to listen to his wise utterances? Hardly, even if we emphasize the fact, that the possession of wealth makes death harder than it is for those who have little or nothing to leave. It is therefore probable that we should seek the wisdom he is uttering in ver. 15. There he expresses the confidence that God will ransom him from the hand of Sheol, "for He will take me." Frequently this is thought to mean no more than that Yahweh will deliver him from premature death. The hand of Sheol is ready to clutch him as its prey, but Yahweh plucks him out of its reach. In that case the mean-

for the author does not operate with this conception, and he is speaking of what happens to the wicked after death. Wellhausen strikes out the clause "and the upright rule over them." He says it "is an interpolation which is extremely inappropriate in this passage. It shows, however, most characteristically the longing of the Jews for Messianic rule." He retains the word translated "in the morning" *babbōqer*, but translates "soon" connecting with the next clause. Klostermann retains the consonants, but points and divides differently, reading *wᵉyērᵉdū bᵉmēyshārīm* "and they go down smoothly" or "by level ways." This connects very well with the preceding words, though whether it is quite what would have been expected is more dubious. Duhm accepts it.

ing would be that while he has to die in due course, he is saved from imminent death. But the context shows that here we ought to have a contrast between the fate of the Psalmist and that of the ungodly rich. We should have a contrast if the latter were said to die prematurely. But this is not the case. They die in the normal course of things in spite of their wealth. The contrast lies between what the wicked cannot buy from God, and what the Psalmist receives from God as an act of grace. Such a contrast would be given if the writer said that while the wicked died, he lived on upon earth. But that is not the contrast he has in mind. All must die, he as well as the rest. But while the wicked are driven down to the dim under-world, God saves him, when he dies, from this fate, and takes him to live with Himself. The phraseology recalls the story of Enoch, and we must reckon the Psalm as one of the immortality Psalms. This new doctrine it is which is regarded by the author as a wise saying, worthy the world's attention.

The Seventy-third Psalm strikes a still deeper note. It opens with a confession of God's goodness to the pure in heart, which springs from the experience the Psalmist is going to describe. For this conviction had not been reached without a hard struggle, in which his faith had all but failed him. His own life had been lived in purity, yet he had suffered without respite. And in glaring contrast to his own lot was the prosperity of the wicked. They were free from pangs,

lived in perfect health, and were untroubled by the miseries that oppress the rest of mankind. So they became haughty and violent, their ill-deeds sprang from an unfeeling heart, their imagination led them to utter perverse and lofty speeches, as if they were no mere mortals but denizens of heaven. The people flocked to them, and judging by their prosperity, pronounced them free from fault, and spake lightly of God's omniscience. As he considered their fortunate lot, he felt that his own efforts for purity had been misspent, for he had been exposed to the constant buffeting of fate. As he thought, so also he spoke, and Israelite though he was, became faithless to his people. Yet though he uttered this traitorous conclusion, the problem still vexed his mind. And as he pondered it, he was initiated into God's sacred mysteries, and saw the dark destiny prepared for the godless. The veil that hides the future which awaits men after death was lifted for him. There in the other world he saw how God dashed them down to ruin in a moment, how they were dragged into the depths, appalled with nameless terrors. How foolish then to be perplexed at their prosperity, so grievous to him in the dream of his ignorance, so contemptible now he has awakened to a true knowledge of the future! Penitently he confesses his error, his previous pain had been due to his brute-like ignorance. In contrast to their fleeting happiness and the shuddering horrors that will meet them on the other side, how blessed his own lot. He lives in

unbroken fellowship with God, feeling the warm clasp of His hand, and guided through life by His counsel. Strong in the assurance of God's presence faith triumphs over death. Already he knows that his communion with God is so close, so intimate, that nothing can destroy it. Death must come, but not death itself can separate him from the love of God. He will be taken to that glory in which God dwells. What then have heaven or earth to offer him, since God is the sole possession in which he takes delight? His powers may fail him, his body waste away, but for evermore it is God, Who is his strength and portion. While they who wander far from Him will perish, his own blessedness lies in his soul's nearness to Him.

The text of the Psalm is not well preserved, and there are numerous difficulties in its interpretation. The following translation is offered as an approximation to its original meaning:

Surely God is good to Israel,[4]
To the pure in heart.
But as for me, my feet had all but swerved,
My steps had well-nigh slipped.

[4] The parallelism suggests that in the first line we should have a word expressing moral excellence corresponding to "pure in heart." We gain this, if with Duhm we read the consonants translated "Israel" not as one word but as two, reading *layyāshār 'ēl*, and translating the first line "Surely God is good to the upright." In that case *'ĕlohim* belongs to the next line, which is at present too short, and may be translated, "even God to the pure in heart." The rather awkward

For I was envious at the boasters,
When I saw the success of the wicked.
For they have no pangs,[5]
Sound and fat is their body.
In the misery of mortals they have no part,
And with other men they are not stricken.
Therefore pride is their necklace,
A garment of violence covers them.
Their iniquity[6] comes forth out of fatness,
The imaginations of their heart overflow.
They mock and speak in wickedness,
Perversity[7] they speak from on high.
They have set their mouth in the heavens,
And their tongue walks in the earth,
Therefore the people return to them,
And they find no blemish in them ;[8]

conjunction of *'ēl* and *'ĕlohim* is due to the Elohistic reviser, who substituted the latter for Yahweh. I have not given effect to the suggestion in my translation, though it may very well be correct. That the plural in the second line is balanced by a singular in the first need occasion no difficulty.

[5] Instead of *l^emōthām* "at their death" we should no doubt, dividing the consonants, read *lāmō tām*. The former word means "to them" ("there are no pangs to them"), the latter word is that translated "sound."

[6] Reading with the LXX. and most commentators *'ăwōnāmō* instead of the text *'ēynēmō* "their eye." The meaning is that their iniquity comes "out of a gross, unfeeling heart." (Driver, *Parallel Psalter*, p. 208).

[7] So, rather than as "oppression," Buhl in the last edition of Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, and Duhm.

[8] The Hebrew margin reads "Therefore his people return hither, and waters of fulness are drained by them," and this is supported by the versions against the Kethib "he bringeth back his people hither." The text is suspicious. Wellhausen, improving on Lagarde's emenda-

And they say,[9] "How does God know,
And is there knowledge in the Most High?"
See, these are the wicked,
And, at ease for ever, they increase their power.
"Surely in vain have I cleansed my heart,
And washed in innocency my hands;
Yet I was stricken all the day,
And my reproof came every morning."
I said, "Thus will I speak;"[10]
Lo, to the generation of thy sons was I traitor.
And I pondered how to know this,
Misery was in it in mine eyes,
Till I penetrated into God's holy secrets,[11]
Considered their destiny.

tion, reads for the first line "Therefore are they satisfied with bread," which involves little alteration, and gives an excellent parallel to the second line. Baethgen feels that bread and water is not what we should expect in a description of the fortunes of the wealthy oppressor. He thinks with several that the reference to water is figurative for the false teaching of the wicked, which is drunk in by their fellow-countrymen. Accordingly he does not emend the text. The translation given above follows Duhm's reading, *'ām 'āleyhem* in the first line, and *mūm lō yimts'ĕū* in the second, which is little more than a fresh division of the consonants. The meaning is that the people judge from the prosperity of the wicked that they have chosen the better part.

[9] Apparently it is the people mentioned in the previous verse, who are the speakers. Opinions differ as to where their speech ends. I think, on the whole, it is best to make it embrace this verse only, the poet himself resuming with "See these are the wicked."

[10] The present text is incomplete "If I said I will tell like," we need to complete it with "this," or "these things." I follow Baethgen in striking out "if," which may have arisen through dittography of the next two letters. The poet *had* spoken in this way.

[11] The line is commonly translated "Until I went into the sanctuary of God." Had he then been staying away all the time his trouble was

Surely thou settest them in slippery places,
Castest them down into ruins.
How are they become a desolation in a moment,
Hurried away, ended by terrors.
As a dream after waking shall they be,[12]
When thou art aroused, thou shalt despise their semblance.
When my heart was soured,
And I felt a stab in my reins,
Then I was a brute and knew not,

vexing him? The word is plural, "sanctuaries," and it yields a much finer thought, with Hitzig and some other scholars, we take the word to mean God's sacred mysteries. There is no need to infer with Duhm that the poet was actually initiated into mysteries, which gave instruction on the life after death. At the same time I agree with him in thinking that in what follows we have a description of the fate of the oppressor after death. Experience would have contradicted, for so profound a thinker, any such view of their fate as happening in this life.

[12]The present text suggests that when God awakes He will despise their semblance, as a man despises his dream when he wakes from it to realities. The thought, however, that God is at present asleep and the victim of an illusion which He will despise when He awakes cannot have been in the Psalmist's mind. We shall accordingly be obliged to fall back on the interpretation that when God rouses Himself to judgment He despises their semblance, just as a man despises his dream when he wakes from it. This, however, is not the immediate impression of the simile. Wellhausen strikes out *'ădōnāy*, "O Lord." He gives no reason, but it may be supposed was influenced by some such consideration as that mentioned above. The sense we want seems to be that when a man is wakened from the ignorance in which he now slumbers, he will see things as they are, and despise the phantoms which now seem such solid realities. This is the sense given in the translation above. Instead of striking out *'ădōnāy* we may suppose with Duhm that it is substituted for Yahweh, as it was usually substituted in reading. If we further correct Yahweh into *yihᵉyū* we get the sense, "shall they be." We have a similar case probably in the famous passage, Psalm 45⁶, where *'ĕlōhīm* should probably be *yihᵉyeh*, "Thy throne shall be for ever and ever."

A very beast[13] I became towards Thee.
But I am continually with Thee,
Thou holdest my right hand,
With Thy counsel Thou wilt guide me,
And afterwards to glory Thou wilt take me.[14]
Whom have I in heaven ?
And possessing Thee I delight in nought upon earth.
Though my flesh and my heart fail away,
God is for ever the rock of my heart and my portion.
For, lo, they that go far from Thee shall perish,
Thou dost cut off every one that goes wantonly astray from Thee.
But as for me, nearness to God is my good,
I have made my refuge in the Lord Yahweh,
To recount all Thy works.[15]

If the Psalm has been correctly interpreted, the solution of the problem is attained by reference to the state after death. In this it differs from Psa.

[13] So Driver translates, taking *behēmōth* as an intensive plural. Some think behemoth is intended, as in Job. Duhm reads the singular.

[14] I take *achar* as an adverb meaning afterwards, and *kābōd* as accusative expressing direction, "to glory." We might also translate "with glory." The Hebrew is no doubt peculiar, Wellhausen thinks it indefensible and reads *achărēyka bᵉyād*, "And takest me by the hand after Thee" (see also Smend *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, 1st ed. p. 453). The alteration yields a fine thought, but it is one already substantially expressed, and one not nearly so deep as that given by the present text. If accepted, it would be better to read *bᵉyādī*. Cheyne (*Jewish Religious Life*, p. 240) reads, "And make known to me the path of glory."

[15] Duhm may be right in thinking that this line is a later addition. The impression of the Psalm is not strengthened by it, and its regularity is disturbed since the line has no parallel.

37, which also solves the difficulty by eschatology, but simply with a reference to the judgment in which the wicked are to be slain, while the righteous survive and inherit the land. It moves essentially on the same lines as that of Psa. 49, but it heightens the contrast, and is incomparably richer and deeper in expression. How striking is the difference between the bloodless description of the one and the lurid terrors of the other! And how tame the utterance of hope for a happy future compared with the wonderful picture of the soul in deep, untroubled fellowship with God, so deep that Death cannot sever it, so perfect that heaven itself can add nothing to it!

Here also the writer has really reached a point where his problem sinks into insignificance. He lives in God and in that rapture the pains of earth sting him no longer. Since God is his portion, the sufferings of this life do not disturb his peace. And even the glory, to which he knows that he will be taken means essentially nothing more than he has already in his possession of God. Nowhere else in the Old Testament is the essence of religion set forth with such power and such beauty, no passage makes so deep an appeal to our inmost heart. It ranks with Jeremiah's prophecy of the New Covenant, with the Second Isaiah's description of the suffering Servant, with the fourth chapter of the Book of Jonah, those most marvellous monuments of the religious genius of Israel.

CHAPTER VII.

The Apocalyptist and the Pessimist.

THE miseries, which filled the century after the Return, lived on through long stretches of the centuries that followed, relieved by happier intervals, and culminating in the horrors and splendours of the Maccabean age. Our Psalter reflects the condition of things during the post-exilic period, though it may include some poems of an earlier time. But other currents were set in motion or accelerated by the sufferings of Judah, which demand some notice before the discussion draws to its close.

The sorrows of the present sent many for comfort to the future. It must be, so the pious thought in many an agonising moment, when ground by the heel of the foreign tyrant or of their own apostate countrymen, it must surely be that day cannot but dawn after darkness so intense. How could life otherwise be tolerable, if when endurance was strained to snapping point, the hope of imminent deliverance did not lift them above their despair?

So they fed their courage with the illusion that they were living at the thrilling hour of crisis. As they flagged in the dreary march, they said to each other, God's kingdom will break on our sight at the next turn of the road. They studied the ancient prophets, combined their pictures of the glorious future into a systematic whole, and sought from their scattered hints to formulate a prophetic chronology. Loss of political independence led to the expectation of deliverance by catastrophe rather than by an evolution from the existing political situation. As the drama reaches its climax, God strikes in and crushes the heathen oppressor. In an instant, without preparation, the transition is effected from dense gloom to the radiant light. The strange symbolism and elaborate allegories are a development of features found in the prophets, the later prophets especially, and perhaps were also fostered by the need for caution in perilous times. The seer wrapped up in an allegory what it was unsafe to utter without disguise. These apocalypses were as a rule represented as revelations to some ancient seer. They often sketch the history from the assumed author's date to the time of the real author, events that have already happened being described with great circumstantiality, which gives place to vague generalities when history in the guise of prediction passes into prediction proper. There is usually a more or less elaborate angelology.

Of apocalypses in the strict sense of the term we

have only one in the Old Testament, the Book of Daniel. But some earlier prophecies have a strong apocalyptic colouring. Zephaniah, though in a mild degree, is perhaps our earliest example, but in Ezekiel it is very marked. Zechariah, Joel, and especially Isa. 24–27 also show us prophecy moving towards apocalyptic.

Joel, whose date may most plausibly be fixed in the fourth century B.C., speaks in a time of great distress, caused partly by drought, which has dried up the streams and given rise to bush and forest fires, but chiefly by an exceptionally severe plague of locusts. The description of the locusts is that of a poet, not of a naturalist, and any exaggeration must be thus explained. The locusts are not a metaphor for soldiers, nor are they supernatural, demoniacal locusts, like those in the Book of Revelation. They are ordinary locusts, but since the prophet sees in them the harbingers of the Day of Yahweh, an eschatological hue is reflected back upon them. So terrible has been the devastation, that the daily meal and drink offering at the Temple have had to be suspended, an ominous portent to the feeling of antiquity, since it seemed to snap the link which bound Yahweh to His people. The prophet calls for a fast and for mourning, bids his countrymen rend their hearts and not their garments and turn to Yahweh. Yet, unlike the early prophets, he complains of no specific sins, so that we may reasonably conclude that he inferred from Judah's calamity its

sinfulness in God's sight. And this is confirmed by the fact that the trouble was healed by a solemn assembly, not by moral reformation and the forsaking of definite sins. In that case our problem is conceived really on conventional lines. The severe suffering of Judah is due to its sin, though what this sin may be is not known, and its existence is a mere inference from the extreme distress under which the country is labouring.

It is not necessary for our purpose to discuss at length the apocalypse which we now read in Isa. 24–27. Although Duhm's argument accepted by Cheyne, Marti, and apparently Skinner, for its composite character, and his analysis, seem to me in the main convincing, I cannot accept the 2nd and 1st century dates, which he assigns to it. The period from Artaxerxes Ochus to Alexander the Great appears to offer the most suitable occasion, and most worthily to explain the language employed. The problem of Judah's suffering emerges only slightly, though it lies behind much that the writers say. The main apocalypse describes a universal judgment on the nations for bloodshed and oppression. The chief insertion is 26^{1-19}, which begins with praise for God's mercies, and passes into desire for complete deliverance, ending with the anticipation of a resurrection to fill the depleted land. Perhaps 27^{7-11} is another insertion, a passage unhappily very obscure, but apparently tracing Judah's present evil condition to its sin, finding encouragement in the mildness of

God's earlier judgments, and promising pardon upon repentance. The points that specially demand attention are the reference to " the host of the height on high " (24^{21}), and the prediction of the annihilation of death (25^{8}), and of a resurrection (26^{19}). The first of these touches a point already mentioned. The author glancing over the blood-stained history of the great empires, and foretelling their punishment through the mighty political convulsions that are about to desolate the world, includes not simply the earthly, but also the heavenly rulers of the nations, in the punishment Yahweh is about to inflict. Here we have the same thought as in Pss. 58, 82, that the miseries of the world are largely to be accounted for by the misgovernment of the angelic guardians of the nations, who are here represented as in Psa. 82, as doomed to punishment, though the form of the penalty differs. The reference to the annihilation of death does not arise in connection with our problem, and I refer to it here simply for its relation to eschatological questions which do arise at some points of our enquiry. The prediction of a resurrection is important, since it is the earliest instance of the transference to the individual of the hope that had previously been expressed for the nation. It is quite easy to see how this took place. The writer is troubled that the land is so thinly peopled, and rises to the great conviction that God's life-giving dew shall fall on those who sleep in the dust, and cause them to arise, so that the land may once more be

thickly inhabited. It is only of pious Israelites ("thy dead") that the author is thinking.

It would be hard to overrate the influence of the Book of Daniel on later religious thought. It was issued about 165 B.C. to encourage the Jews in the terrible persecution they were suffering from Antiochus Epiphanes for loyalty to their religion. Much of it has no direct bearing on our problem, except in so far as it is designed to assure the faithful Jews that the oppressor shall soon be broken and the reign of the saints begin. Two special points must be noticed since they do bear on the special question before us. Both are developments of what we have found in Isa. 24–27. One is the place assigned to the angelic princes. The angel who appears to Daniel in the tenth chapter explains the delay in his arrival by saying that for twenty-one days the prince of Persia had withstood him, but "Michael, one of the chief princes," came to help him. He informs him further that as soon as he has revealed the message, he must return to fight with the prince of Persia, and afterwards with the prince of Greece. In this conflict "there is none that strengtheneth himself with me against these, except Michael your prince." Towards the close of the vision it is said that when Antiochus falls: "Michael shall stand up, the great prince who stands for the children of thy people" (12^1). There is to be an unprecedented tribulation, but all who are written in the book, *i.e.*, the book of life, shall be delivered. Here, once more,

the miseries of earth are due to the angelic powers. The conflicts of earth have first been fought in heaven between the patron angels of the nations. While in Deuteronomy the other nations have each its angel, but Israel has Yahweh, in Daniel Israel has Michael for its angel. This development is largely due to the overwhelming sense of the transcendence of God.

The second point is the prediction of a resurrection. "And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to reproaches and everlasting abhorrence. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever" ($12^{2,3}$). The passage springs out of the historical circumstances. The hope of a life with God in heaven had already found expression, and a physical resurrection had been predicted as the remedy for the depopulation of the land. But what works specially on our author's mind is the heroic constancy to God, displayed by the martyrs. When Israel triumphs, and God's kingdom is set up on earth, they must be raised from the dead to share in its glories. The wise, who turn many to righteousness, are apparently distinguished from the rank and file of the risen ones. But the passage reflects also the internal conflicts in the contemporary Judaism. The apostates who have renounced the faith of their people are not to remain in Sheol. They are brought back to life,

that there in the Messianic kingdom they may for ever hear the reproaches and endure the loathing of those whom they have betrayed.

Not all Jews could take refuge from the miseries of the present, in glowing pictures of an imminent golden age. Where faith has lost its spring, the earnest soul, that is keenly sensitive to the miseries of mankind, drifts easily towards pessimism. Such was the case of him to whom we owe the Book of Ecclesiastes.[1] Its date is not certain, but we may with most probability assign it to the close of the third or the opening of the second century B.C., though the possibility of a Hasmonean or even of a Herodian date is not excluded. The author's meaning is not always clear, and two causes have combined to conceal it still more from the general reader. One is that Solomon has been regarded as the author, and in direct antithesis to the main current of its thought has been imagined to have

[1] For a statement of the critical conclusions that are here presupposed, I may refer to my article *Ecclesiastes* in Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible*. Since that was written other theories have been advanced. The most important is perhaps Siegfried's in his commentary on the work in Nowack's *Hand-Kommentar* (1898). It reminds one to some extent of his treatment of *Job* in *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament*. The original author was a pessimist, who had broken with Judaism, and was mainly influenced by Stoicism. His work was glossed by four writers representing Epicurean Sadduceeism, Jewish wisdom, Jewish piety, and a prudential view of life. After a first redactor had compiled the work and added 12^{8} as a closing formula, $12^{9,10}$ was added, then $12^{11,12}$, and $12^{13,14}$ by the final redactor. The English reader may see an outline of the theory and a brief sketch of the contents of the book from this point of view in Siegfried's article

written it in a penitent old age. The other is that it has been interpolated in an orthodox interest, to break the point of much that the author says. Yet we need not push this just conclusion to the extreme of finding as many writers as there are tendencies in the book, for the author was a man whose thought was not rigidly consistent, and whose expression varied with his mood. In the main he has a definite view of life. This is that all is vanity. As he looks back on his own career and sums up its impression, this is the verdict he deliberately passes on it. Life is meaningless and a mockery, since man's powers crave a sphere of action, and their exercise achieves no abiding result. The fundamental law of existence is that life is a closed circle from which man cannot get away. All things move in a cycle, what is now, has been before, and will be again, and there is no new thing under the sun. Hence there can be no progress. There is no

Wisdom in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. Its value lies in its forcing into prominence the different tendencies that are present in the book; but I think more of them could be combined in a single personality than Siegfried admits. His theory is accepted by H. P. Smith, *Old Testament History*, p. 439, but is adversely criticised by Laue in a monograph entitled *Das Buch Koheleth und die Interpolationshypothese Siegfried's* (Wittenberg, 1900). Other discussions are to be found in Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life*, pp. 183—208 (Herodian date, interpolation in orthodox interest, omission of objectionable passages, deliberate dislocation of order to destroy the connexion). Davidson's article in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* reaches practically the same results as the article in Hastings' *Dictionary*. Cheyne adds a useful series of notes on recent discussions.

profit in our toil; we are climbing a treadmill, not a stairway to heights yet unreached. All things are fixed in their order by God, and occur regardless of our endeavours to help or thwart them. What God does is for ever, no human effort can increase or lessen the sum total of things. Hence all efforts for reform are hopeless, the wheel of fate spins round, and man, himself lashed to it, can neither accelerate nor retard its motion. If we imagine that anything is new, that is an error. For generations ago it was known, and it is only the fact, that those who knew it have died and their very memory is forgotten, which makes it possible for it to be thought a novelty. As the author thinks of this dreary grind, his soul is filled with loathing for its unspeakable weariness: "All things are full of weariness; man cannot utter it; the eye is not satisfied with seeing nor the ear with hearing." (1[8])

Now the thought that there is a reign of law, a fixed cycle in which history moves, might bring inspiration to a man. If he could discover the law, then he might work with it and make himself one with the main stream of the universe; even though his work ended in nothing permanent, he still might win a large satisfaction for his own brief life. But this is just what he cannot do. God has planned minutely the whole order of things, nay, He has implanted within men the instincts and impulses that move them to busy themselves with the things He has ordained. But it is man's misery that God

has deliberately withheld knowledge, while He has imparted impulse. Hence man is driven to seek his satisfaction in the world, but he seeks it blindfold. Careful foresight may just as well lead him wrong as right. The man gifted with wisdom may think he has detected the law of events. But this is self-deception, "though a wise man think to know it, yet he shall not be able to find it." Thus man's utmost avails him nothing. He does not know his time, hence he may ruin everything by excessive zeal or a too prudent caution. Qualifications and ability do not serve him: "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favour to men of skill; but time and chance happeneth to them all" (9^{11}). Hence, while to the eye of God everything comes in its order and all things are beautiful in their season, man who has no clue to the maze, can see in the world's happenings no harmonious order, but only the reign of caprice. It is mere chance whether he hits or misses the moment of fate, whether the plans, he has laid so carefully, coincide or not with the plans of God. Moreover, God has freely chosen to make man's life thus unmeaning. He guards His secret, resolute that men shall not divine it. He wills to humble their proud conceit, that they may know themselves to be no better than the beasts. Thus they are snared in an evil net, since the knowledge is withheld that would enable them to escape its meshes.

This hopeless view of life is not merely asserted, the author seeks to prove it. He has reached it as the result of exhaustive experiment. He had tried the roads, which lead, as men think, to satisfaction. But always his search had ended in disenchantment. Wisdom he found to be vain. The very impulse to seek it involved him in sore labour, and in much wisdom he discovered much sorrow, and increase of knowledge he learnt to be increase of pain. Some advantage, it is true, wisdom has over folly. Yet it all ends in death and utter oblivion, and in the long run the wise is no better than the fool. But if wisdom does not satisfy, may not happiness be attained through pleasure? Clothing his experiences here, as in the previous case, in the form of experiences of Solomon, the writer tells us that he sought satisfaction in the delights of the senses, in vast riches, in works of building and husbandry. He was not a sensualist for the sake of wallowing in debauchery. His wisdom remained with him, in other words he investigated pleasure as a scientific experimentalist bent on discovering the answer to a problem. And here, too, he reached an unfavourable result, and felt that he hated life for its ineffectiveness.

In the course of his book he communicates more of his observations. The labour of life is vain, since the wise man may have a fool for his heir. Moreover, if he accumulates wealth, it means the burden of a larger household; it implies incessant toil by day, and anxious, sleepless nights; he may lose it all and

be plunged into poverty ; or he may lose the capacity to enjoy the pleasures and comforts it might procure him ; and in any case he has at last to die and relinquish it. Once more, wherever we look abroad in the world we see misery. Government is an organised system of oppression. We need not wonder, for those who oppress the subject, are themselves the victims of the rapacity of their superiors, and the latter similarly suffer from those above them. Thus on the hapless subjects of a province weighs the accumulated oppression of rank above rank of civil servants. And as the author, tender-hearted but despairing, considers the tears of the wronged and how they have no comforter, he exclaims, far better the fate of those long dead, than of those who suffer these intolerable pains, but best of all is it never to have been born. He had seen the enthusiasm of the people when the reign of an old king, too old to mend his ways or take counsel, had given place to the reign of a new monarch. But he knew that here too, disillusion was bound to come. He had seen the inversion of social distinctions, slaves on horseback and princes trudging on foot, fools in positions of dignity. He had marked, perhaps he had suffered from, the ubiquity of spies, and learnt how necessary it was to avoid all criticism of the ruling powers. He had known great benefits repaid with ungrateful forgetfulness, and he had noticed how the wisdom of the poor was despised. He is especially bitter about women, wherein there is no

doubt disclosed a singularly unfortunate experience: "One man out of a thousand have I found, but a woman among all these I have not found."

The misgovernment of the world by man is all in a line with the government of God. On this, however, the author speaks with different voices. He refers to the divine judgment, and says that it shall be well with those who fear God. Yet he tells us that a righteous man perishes in his righteousness, and a wicked man prolongs his life in evil doing. All have the same fate. "All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good and to the evil; to the clean and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth, and him that sacrificeth not: as is the good so is the sinner; and he that sweareth as he that feareth an oath. This is an evil, in all that is done under the sun, that there is one event to all" ($9^{2,3}$). The author has not abandoned a belief in God, but the belief has been practically emptied of religious content. He knows no rapture of sweet familiar intercourse, but thinks of God as the austere ruler, who is to be dreaded and on whose forbearance it would be perilous to presume. Into His presence man should enter with caution, and remembering that God is in heaven, while he is on earth, he should not be too glib in his religious exercises, but should see that his words are few. Especially he should beware lest he suffer himself to be carried away by religious enthusiasm and undertake pledges, which he will not

wish to carry out in cold blood. "When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for He has no pleasure in fools" (5^4).

The author's maxims for the conduct of life are of singular interest. At the best, life is wretched. It is better to go to the house of mourning than the house of feasting, and the day of death is better than the day of birth. It is well for man to be patient and resigned, to accept the inevitable and recognise that it is impossible to straighten what God has made crooked. While all enterprise is made uncertain by man's ignorance of God's design, yet it is best to work on, disregarding this fact. Do not, he says, wait timidly till opportunity seems more favourable, but boldly venture. Do not relax your efforts, for one may fail and another succeed, indeed, both alike may chance to prosper. Withal, it is well to be prudent and to prepare for possible mischances. A special form that prudence may wisely take is benevolence, distributed over a wide area, for calamity may come, and possibly some who have been helped, may be willing to repay their debt.

There is no remedy for the ills of life, but there is some mitigation. "A man has no better thing under the sun than to eat and drink and enjoy himself" (8^{15}). "There is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and make his soul enjoy good in his labour" (2^{24}). This is the gift of God to be taken and used, without anxious fear

whether it is right or wrong. "Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart; for God has already accepted thy works" (9^{7}, cf. 2^{24}, 3^{13}, 5^{18-20}, 8^{15}). The author does not recommend a debased sensualism; he speaks with bitterness of "the woman whose heart is snares and nets, and her hands as bands" (7^{26}). It is rather a moderate enjoyment of the good things of life, its simple pleasures, food and drink, and wedded life. The extremes alike of indulgence and restraint should be avoided: "Be not righteous over much; neither make thyself overwise: why shouldest thou destroy thyself? Be not over much wicked, neither be thou foolish: why shouldest thou die before thy time?" (7^{16-17}).

The exhortations to snatch from life what pleasure one may, gain much of their significance from the author's old-fashioned view of the future. He flatly denies the doctrine of a future life in any worthy sense of the term. Men, he says outright, are beasts; the lot of one is the lot of the other; in the dim underworld, whither man is going, "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom" (9^{10}). "The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten" (9^{5}). So if a man seek any relief from his misery, let him seize the fleeting moment, mindful that in Sheol no pleasure will be possible to him any more. "If a man lives many years, let him rejoice in them all; but let him remember the days of dark-

ness, for they shall be many" (11^8). Especially he should rejoice in his youth, remembering the evil days of old age, when with the failure of all his bodily powers, his zest for pleasure will pass away (11^9-12^7).

To some it may seem strange, that God should have suffered such a book to be included in the Old Testament Canon. And if we sought to find everywhere in the Old Testament a word of God, which should speak the Divine message to us, we should be justly mystified with a book that affirmed the doctrines it contains. That all life is vanity and striving after wind; that God has deliberately withheld from men the knowledge by which they might successfully order their lives; that progress is impossible; that a moderate enjoyment of the good things of the world is the chief thing to be pursued, and pursued as the best anodyne for the radical disease of life; that man perishes like the beasts, and after death can look forward only to the interminable gloom of Sheol: all these would amply suffice to exclude the book from the Old Testament, if the view I have mentioned were correct. It is not an imperfect Christianity that we find in it, but rather the negation of all that makes the Gospel dear. Yet if we are content to look at the question from a historical point of view, we shall see good reason to rejoice that it was included in the Canon. The edifying additions, which turned it into a more pious work, helped to check the mischief it might otherwise

have done to those with a mechanical and unhistorical conception of revelation. But, for a sounder view, these additions are not needful to justify its presence in Scripture. For we see in the Old Testament a preparation for Christ. Such a preparation was not simply along the line of anticipation and approach. Rightly to appraise Christianity we required an object lesson, which should convince us how much the world needed it. The moral bankruptcy of Greece and Rome presents us with an impressive example of what we are seeking. But Judaism, was it not competent to carry through the world's reformation? We cannot forget the close approximations to Christianity, which at its best, the religion of Israel achieved. But we do well to ponder also the darker side. Its legalism, its tedious casuistry, its danger of self-righteousness, its narrow exclusiveness, its bitter vindictiveness, all these must be taken into account; while we must never forget how needful it is for us to cleanse our own religion from these faults by strenuous fidelity to the spirit and temper of the Gospel. And I think that Ecclesiastes is here peculiarly instructive. It puts the logic of a non-Christian position with tremendous force, to all who feel keenly the misery of the world. More vividly than anything else in the Old Testament, it shows us how imperious was the necessity for the revelation of God in Christ. There is much in the Old Testament from which a Christian instinctively recoils. It constitutes the dark back-

ground against which God has set the radiant figure of His Son, and it drives home to us with quite peculiar power, how much the world needed the authentic voice, to redress the balance and assure us that all is well.

CHAPTER VIII.

Solution or Escape?

THE problem of pain is of all problems the most baffling to many who wish to accept a theistic view of the universe. Even sin and death are mysteries less oppressive and impenetrable. If sin is a darker evil, pain is the more obscure. The freedom to choose the better, which confers all its moral worth on obedience to the Divine will, involves the freedom to choose the worse. It is, moreover, the natural impulse of every creature to seek its own ends, and seek them along its own lines. With inexperience and the inability to take long views, with the overwhelming pressure of the physical and external, with all the inherited passion derived from untold ages of brute ancestry, we need not marvel that man seeks the immediate pleasure, and that his will should clash with the holy will of God. But does not this merely thrust the difficulty a stage further

back, and prove God at fault for so constituting man that sin was inevitable? No doubt God must accept responsibility for His act, but how else was He to proceed? The struggle must be real, if man's victory was to be of worth; the dice must not be loaded in his favour. Was it not also more fit that man should have come to be by the slow escape from the brute's wholly finite and non-moral life into consciousness of a moral order and sense of the Divine, than that the continuity of life should be ruptured, and those elements in his nature which have made his trial so severe have found no place in a creature fresh from the hand of God? For thus the conditions in which he is to receive his moral discipline are natural and not artificial.

And still less can death be called an evil. This is obviously true as it affects the race. No death would soon mean no birth; those in possession would prevent new comers from trenching on their domain. Thus life with its blessings would be confined to the few, instead of being distributed to many swiftly succeeding generations. In such a world progress would be inconceivably difficult, the dead weight of custom would crush all aspirations to reform. Even if fresh lives came into it, what could they do, pitted against the tyranny of tradition backed by power and the timidity of experience? Far better that death should remove the men callous to abuse and hostile to reform, and that men of warmer impulses, higher ideals, more generous enthusiasm

should fill their place. The treasures of the past are not therefore lost, but made the solid basis for future progress. And, even for the individual, death is in itself no unhappy fate. It may be untimely, it may be tragic, because it cuts short a career full of promise, or robs the world of the fruits of genius, or the harvest of long labour and research. Or in other ways it may be invested through its circumstances with evil in this form or that. But in itself death should be a welcome guest. Immortality of any kind would be no boon, were not infinite resources available to satisfy each new craving as it arose. But physical immortality might well be intolerable, the captive spirit for ever beating its bars in vain, or the body weary of its burden and unable to lay it down. Even if death meant complete extinction of being, there is in that nothing terrible. Nature, no doubt, secures the preservation of the species by the instinctive clinging to life which she has implanted in the individual. But the recoil from extinction, which springs from this instinct, gains all its force through an illusion, an unconscious contradiction. The pathos with which it is invested is due simply to this that the individual unconsciously thinks himself back into existence to contemplate his own non-existence, he projects the feeling of revulsion that he experiences before the event, into the future when all power of contemplation and feeling has passed away. But in spite of our imagination the extinct person has no con-

sciousness, and is not aware, as the sentimentalist tricks himself into fancying, of the misery of his condition. How many tired workers, worn out with the unceasing strain on strength and brain and nerve, would sink gladly into a rest that should never again be disturbed by the call to labour or to pastime! How many, whose days and nights stretch them on the rack of anguish, would hail the sleep that knows no waking, whether to pleasure or pain! They are past caring for happiness, all that they crave is rest. It is the bereaved for whom death is a tragedy, but this aspect demands consideration rather as a form of suffering.

It is true that the mystery of suffering has its palliatives. Pain teaches us a tenderness and sympathy for those who suffer. It gives new care and watchfulness to our love, stimulates us to self-forgetfulness and helpful service. And if the contemplation of pain be thus beneficent, so too may be its endurance. Leaving aside the part it plays as a danger signal, pointing to mischief in the physical organism, that might do irreparable damage, if its insidious movement were not thus rudely detected, we know full well what noble spiritual ends it often serves. It disciplines our waywardness, convinces us by its stern retribution how stringent a demand the order under which we live makes upon us, it sweetens the temper, softens and refines the character and braces the will. Even the shock of bereavement has in it some element of good. The knowledge

that it may come checks the hasty and irretrievable word that may so soon torture us with vain regrets, it bids us love and serve our friends, ere they pass beyond our reach. And when they have left us, with what new sacredness and solemnity we cherish their memory. Death has disclosed to us their ideal significance, it has disengaged the essential spirit from earth's poor expression, the trivial and transient have fallen from them. The separations life has made, death has often healed.

But when all these things have been freely admitted, it is plain that they are quite inadequate to meet the appalling difficulties of the problem. Even to the palliatives mentioned there is another side. In some the contemplation of pain rouses irritation and disgust, while the endurance of it only exasperates and embitters them. The thought of possible bereavement darkens our lives with foreboding; the experience, even if remorse be absent, bruises us where we are most sensitive, and often means the permanent impoverishment of our life. And when we turn our gaze to the world's actual misery, little as we know of it, we are overwhelmed by it, so innumerable, intolerable, inexcusable seem the pains of the sentient universe. The wrongs of the lower creation at the hands of Nature or of man, even though they are not intensified by suspense or magnified by anticipation and the faculty of connected thought, constitute in themselves a grave indictment against the morality of the order under

which we live, all the more that, so far as we see, they serve few of the useful ends fulfilled by human pain. And who can number the wrongs of man? Even in our softer and humaner age and country we are confronted by evils which strike horror into our hearts. And when we widen our outlook to take in those other lands, less happy even than our own, or peer into the past and scan the ages when brutal ferocity or malignant and ingenious cruelty reigned unchecked, we shudder and are dumb before the insolent cynicism which tramples so ruthlessly on its victims. The fiendish horrors in Armenia or Macedonia, or on the Congo; the callous infliction of extreme pain by the highly civilised on the negro defrauded of human rights; the nameless atrocities decreed by Persia to the followers of the Bab, all remind us with what slowness progress drags the reluctant nations in its train. Yet ghastly as are these deeds, that stain humanity with indelible shame, they are but a small fraction of the woes, which through long ages have gnawed at the vitals of our hapless race. Think of the victims of superstition and blind terror in savage lands, of the tortures that, in the ages of judicial darkness and malignant bigotry, were made to serve the cause of justice or religion, think how the barbarities of an Assyrian emperor in honour of Asshur, were more than matched by the Inquisitor's nicely adjusted and elaborate refinements of cruelty to the glory of God, and then ask if we can still believe in a Heavenly Father,

when these things are calmly allowed to be. And the fact of our own happier lot, or of the gradual mitigation of man's brutality, and the growth of gentleness and pity, really helps us but little. For if any one wished to deny these favourable signs, there is only too much to support his contention, and even if they be granted, the excruciating agony of the past and the present remains a difficulty wholly unrelieved. The question "Is life worth living?" is not a question touching our own personal life. We may find our life so full of interest that it seems abundantly worth living, and yet we may feel that for many the balance of evil so largely preponderates, that we would gladly surrender our happy existence if they might be released from the misery of theirs.

The Old Testament has placed at our disposal many helpful suggestions. Not least I reckon to be the encouragement to face the problem with moral courage and intellectual honesty. Here we must see to it that our righteousness exceeds the righteousness of self-deluding optimists. Of positive contributions to the answer, apart from the cases where sin is directly punished by the suffering of the sinner, the thought of suffering as a cleansing discipline, as a test of the genuineness of our piety, as endured vicariously for the benefit of others, all have real and permanent value. Helpful also is the reminder of our limitations, which do not permit us to grasp the whole complex order, in which we

live. Moreover, the thought of a happy future life, which is just dawning in the Old Testament, relieves the mystery by the prospect of another existence, in which the miseries of the present may be redressed, and the same may be said of the hope of a resurrection, at least as presented in the Book of Daniel. The fact is clear, however, that what the Old Testament has to tell us does not suffice for a complete solution. The suffering of the non-human sentient creation, itself no light burden on our faith, seems to be but little if at all relieved by these considerations. And, as affirmed in the Old Testament, the ideas are too crude, too insecurely based to serve our need. The doctrine of the vicarious character of suffering, as developed in the Fourth Servant Poem, not merely stands quite by itself, but has only a national significance. The doctrine of immortality is found in very few passages, and many scholars have denied that it is really present in these, so vague and undefined is the language, in which it is expressed.

The most valuable thing the Old Testament has to offer us is not a speculative solution. It is the inner certainty of God, which springs out of fellowship with Him, and, defying all the crushing proofs that the government of the world is unrighteous, holds its faith in Him fast. But it was only the rarest spirits, that could feel so intensely the horror of the facts, and

yet could escape into a region where it haunted them no longer.

We need more than the Old Testament has to give us. Do we find it in Christianity? The interpretation of suffering as punitive or disciplinary, or educative, remains as valid as before. The thought of the vicarious suffering of the innocent for the guilty gets a far deeper significance. Christianity throws great stress on the conception of human solidarity. We are all members one of another, each shares in the suffering of all, all share in the suffering of each. We see in the more ordinary experiences of life the results of sin fall on the innocent rather than on the guilty, we are sometimes permitted to see that in its measure, such suffering has its redeeming power. But the Gospel bids us recognise the supreme example of this in the Cross of Christ. As we meditate on it, what words so well as the familiar ones express our contrite thought?

> He was pierced through our rebellions,
> Crushed through our sins,
> The chastisement to win our peace was upon Him,
> And by His stripes was healing wrought for us.
> We had all gone astray like sheep,
> We had turned each his own way;
> And Yahweh made to light on Him
> The sin of us all.

Yet if He bears the punishment of our sins, why

do we suffer? It is because He is one with the race; because the pain He suffers is not merely the pain He endured on Calvary, but the pains of that race thus united to Himself. In this thought, which is to the natural man foolishness, we may find a helpful illumination, that will mitigate our resentment because our pain is so meaningless. A worthy meaning is imparted to it, once we feel that Christ has made it His own.

And the hope of immortality, which was in the Old Testament at best a daring venture, has for Christianity become an axiom. The Christian lives in the constant thought of it, comforts himself in bereavement by it, fortifies himself with it against despondency, counts his sufferings light in comparison with the glory its realization is to bring him. He shapes his course in the world, as one who is a stranger and pilgrim, content to remain, while it is God's will, in the country to which he is an alien, but with his heart dwelling in that heaven which he deems his true fatherland. Thus he is not confined to earth for the solution of our problem, but may console himself with the thought that what he cannot know now, he may know hereafter; that the life of earth is but a small section of his existence. Yet even this does not give us what we seek. For while it is precious, I cannot myself feel that it removes by any means all of our difficulties. Suffering will always remain a largely unsolved mystery. Now I have said already that the Old Testament is most

helpful in that it points out to us, not so much a satisfactory speculative explanation, but a path which leads us to peace, though no solution be reached. But from the Old Testament premises it was possible for only the most religiously gifted to attain this. What we need is something that will assure us of God's love, so that we may no longer be fretted by the facts that seem to deny it. It is Christianity alone that gives us this assurance. Its doctrine of the Trinity secures the possibility of ethical relations in God's own being. If it teaches that God's moral nature is love, it shows how this can be, since the circle of the Godhead includes the lover and the loved. Love therefore was never a mere potentiality in God, sleeping till it woke to shed its beneficence on an object other than Himself, but always in that ineffable and unthinkable life, where His Unity as God is not impaired by its inclusion of subject and object, there is the blessed communion of Father, Son, and Spirit. And this love, since it is love, seeks to create new objects, for it does not selfishly desire to restrict its boons, but rather to bring within the reach of its activities all that it may. This love is proved to us by a stupendous sacrifice, in that God gave us the eternal Son. With this assurance we can be at rest. For like Job we feel that our knowledge of God is that which we have heard "by the hearing of the ear." Nature and History alike speak to us with an ambiguous voice. With this hearsay knowledge

of God we can reach no confident foothold. But to know Jesus is to know God; when we see Him we can say to God "Now mine eye seeth Thee." The Vision of God in Jesus brings us peace. All is well, we cannot say how, but we are certain of the fact.

But all this is true, only if Christianity is true, and if Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God. It is not given to me to stand where many stand, to surrender a belief in His Divinity, and yet to hold fast a faith in God's goodness. The longer I ponder the world's pain in itself, the more it seems to deny a moral government of the world, and the more I feel drawn to the conviction that on this, the greatest of all questions, Ecclesiastes has said the last word. And if I do not yield to this temptation, it is because I ponder it also in the light of the Cross, on which the Son of God manifested the eternal love. When thus it is granted us to believe in Jesus, we take courage to believe in God. But Jesus helps us in our need, not only as the manifestation of God's love, but by His own unshaken faith. He knew the sharp anguish of our lot, faced in all its gloom and terror our deepest sorrow, made Himself one with us in our bitterest suffering, endured, without flinching, desertion, betrayal, torture and death. Even in that darker agony, so awful, so solitary, so mysterious, that we turn dizzy as we gaze into its depths, He called God His Father, and said "Thy will be done!" If He, Who knew God, as no other has

known Him, could still in His desperate extremity maintain His firm trust in God's goodness, how much this strengthens our own wavering faith. Yet how can we believe with Jesus, unless we have come to believe in Him? If His Cross is not the key to the riddle of the universe, it darkens the mystery, and makes the travail of creation more unmeaning than ever. But in the face of all our difficulties it is no easy thing to believe in Jesus. We can realise better now than in some ages how true are the words "No man can say Jesus is Lord but in the Holy Spirit." But when once by the grace of God we have dared to make this great affirmation, then we enter into His unspeakable peace. The world's sorrows do not cease to be terrible, and to wring our hearts, we feel them with all the deeper sympathy and inspired by Christ's Spirit, long to relieve them. We understand them but little better, nor can we reconcile them successfully with the love of God. Mystery still besets us behind and before, and all we comprehend of God's work in the universe is "but the outskirts of His ways." Yet we know in Whom we have believed, and if we know that, all our ignorance is insignificant. That knowledge takes us to the centre, and we feel the love that throbs at the heart of creation. We leave our unravelled perplexities behind us; they have fallen from us, and can dismay us no longer. We do not ask the answer, we are content not to know. For no unriddling of the mystery can bring

us a peace more unruffled, than that in which we rest on the bosom of God, that strong Magician, Who, with the wand of His love, has charmed into quiet the doubts that once surged so tempestuously in our breast.

APPENDIX A.

Recent Criticism of Habakkuk.

WE may conveniently take the brief discussion in Giesebrecht's *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, published in 1891, as our point of departure for the criticism of Hab. 1_3^1–2^8. This section had previously been regarded as in its right order, and it had been commonly thought that in 1^{2-4} the prophet complains of the violence of Jewish oppressors in Judah, in 1^{5-11} receives the revelation that Yahweh is about to raise up the Chaldeans to punish them, while in the rest of the section, Habakkuk complains of the tyranny of the Chaldeans and receives the assurance that the righteous shall live by his faithfulness, but the tyrant shall be overthrown by the nations he has spoiled. This view, however, was open to the serious, and probably fatal, objection, that it identified "the wicked" in 1^{2-4} with Jewish sinners, whereas in 1^{12-17} "the wicked" can only be the heathen oppressor. Accordingly some scholars (*e.g.* Wellhausen in 1873) had abandoned this double interpretation, and argued that both in 1^{2-4} and in 1^{12-17} the prophet is complaining that righteous Judah is suffering at the hands of the heathen tyrant. This tyrant was on all hands supposed to be the Chaldean power. But if we identify

"the wicked" in 1^{2-4} with those in 1^{12-17}, and regard the Chaldeans as intended in both, then 1^{2}–2^{3} cannot be explained as it stands. For while $1^{2-4,\ 12-17}$ represents the oppression as long-established, 1^{5-11} represents the Chaldeans as just being raised up to do an incredible work. It was the merit of Giesebrecht to draw the inference that 1^{5-11} could not be in its true context, since it presupposed a situation altogether incompatible with that reflected in $1^{2-4,\ 12-17}$. He assigned the section 1^{1}–2^{8} with the exception of 1^{5-11} to the exile, and 1^{5-11} he assigned to an earlier period, when the Chaldeans were beginning their career of conquest. In 1892 Wellhausen accepted Giesebrecht's conclusion that 1^{5-11} was no part of the original prophecy, as the necessary inference from his own earlier position (*Die Kleinen Propheten* note on Hab. 1^{5-11}). But he thought that the section ended with 2^{4}, and as we may infer from his note on 2^{15-17}, regarded $1^{2-4,\ 12-17}$, 2^{1-4} as pre-exilic. The prophecy, as thus limited, seemed too meagre in its teaching to have needed a revelation.

Meanwhile Budde had independently worked out a wholly new theory, which he published in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1893, pp. 383 ff. He also had observed that 1^{5-11} is out of place where it stands, but did not on that account eliminate it as a foreign element. Its proper place he argued was at the end of the section, after 2^{4}. For in this way we have the prediction of judgment following the description of tyranny, a natural order. But, if so, then the Chaldeans cannot be the oppressor, rather they are raised up to take vengeance upon him. It followed therefore that two heathen nations were referred to, one in 1^{2-4} 1^{12}–2^{4} the oppressor, and the other in 1^{5-11} (or as Budde held 1^{6-11}), the Chaldean avenger. Budde thus

reached the completely new theory that the oppressor was Judah's old tyrant Assyria, and that Habakkuk about 615 B.C. predicted the overthrow of Assyria by the nascent power of the Chaldeans. He has further expounded his theory in the *Expositor*, May, 1895, and, most recently in his article *Habakkuk* in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. Cornill adopted it in the next edition of his Introduction to the Old Testament (*Einleitung in das A.T.*[3,4] 1896, pp. 194, 195), and his popular lectures on Hebrew Prophecy (*Das israelitsche Prophetismus* 1894 pp. 79, 80 E. tr. *The Prophets of Israel*). It has however, been rejected by A. B. Davidson (*Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah* in *The Cambridge Bible*, 1895, pp. 50–55, 139), by Driver (*Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 6th ed. 1897, p. 338 "too ingenious") and by Nowack (*Die Kleinen Propheten*, 1897, pp. 248–250, 259, 260).

In the third edition of his commentary on the Minor Prophets (1898), Wellhausen abides by the view taken in the first, and ignores Budde's theory. On the other hand three scholars have accepted his view that the Chaldeans are raised up to execute judgment on a heathen oppressor. G. A. Smith (*Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. ii., 1898, pp. 123, 124), feeling the difficulties urged against the view that this oppressor was Assyria, suggested that the prophet may have intended Egypt, which for a few years ruled over Judah. Quite recently Peiser, the well-known Assyriologist, has made an entirely new suggestion (*Der Prophet Habakuk* in *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* for 1903, No. 1). Habakkuk criticism has, he thinks, reached a deadlock, and, if progress towards a true solution is to be made, new methods must be employed.

He has been struck with parallels between the prophecy and Assyrian and Babylonian literature, of a kind to suggest that the prophet had some familiarity with this literature and had studied it in the cuneiform script. This would have been possible to a resident in Jerusalem, but there is no reference to Judah, and naturally it is more easily explicable in a writer who lived in Assyria or Babylonia. And that the author was in a foreign land he infers from the emended text of 3^{16}. He assigns to Habakkuk, against the usual critical view, the third chapter, but agrees with Wellhausen that the original poem does not go beyond ver. 16. In that case, he argues, the prophecy cannot have ended with an indeterminate *'am* ("people"), followed by an indeterminate relative sentence. Accordingly for the final word in our present text, *y^{e}gūdennū*, which is a well-known *crux*, he substitutes following the LXX and the Syriac Codex Ambrosianus, *m^{e}gūray*, gaining the sense "which cometh up against the people of my sojourning." If this was the original text, the writer would at the time be in a foreign land. In 3^{13} the poet says, "Thou wentest forth for the salvation of Thy people, For the salvation of Thine anointed." Peiser thinks that by "Thine anointed" the poet meant himself. He infers that he was a hostage at Nineveh, a Jewish prince who, as Yahweh's anointed, had a right to the Jewish throne. Perhaps he was a son or grandson of Manasseh. He would be brought up in the fashion usual at the court of Nineveh, and was probably keenly interested in the library formed by Assurbanipal. The prophecy is left by Peiser in its present order. He agrees with Budde that the Chaldeans are named as the instruments of Yahweh's judgment on the Assyrians. But he regards the violence, of which the

prophet complains, as violence in Nineveh, not in Judah and he takes 1^{5-11} to refer to a past attack of the Chaldeans on Assyria, which from 1^{11} he infers to have been abortive. The prophet looks forward to a second attack on Assyria, which he expects to be successful. The former attack is identified with the first onslaught of the Medes against Nineveh, repulsed in 625 B.C. with the death of the Median prince. The date of the prophecy is fixed about 609. Probably the news of Josiah's death excited this outcry against the power which kept the author from his rights.

A modification of Budde's theory has been proposed by Prof. W. R. Betteridge, of Rochester Theological Seminary, in the *American Journal of Theology* for Oct. 1903. He thinks that the Chaldeans are raised up to execute Yahweh's vengeance on the Assyrians. But he argues that Budde's date is impossible, and that we must go back to a period when the hand of Assyria pressed heavily on Judah. Since, however, Judah is represented as at the time a righteous nation, we cannot assign the prophecy to the reign of Manasseh or the early years of Josiah, but must go back to the time of Hezekiah and date it after his reform. He fixes on 701 B.C. when Sennacherib was recalled from his invasion of Judah by tidings of a revolt in Babylonia. He attributes the whole book to Habakkuk, and retains the present order.

In estimating these theories, the point that seems to be best established is that "the wicked" in 1^{2-4} must be identified with "the wicked" in 1^{12-17}. In other words, Habakkuk does not complain that wicked Jews oppress their righteous countrymen, but that a heathen nation oppresses righteous Judah. Although Davidson and Driver do not admit this, they feel that the usual view

is not altogether satisfactory, but adopt it because it seems the best way to take the passage as it stands, and Budde's rearrangement is for various reasons unsatisfactory. If, then, I venture to dissent from their conclusion it is in deference to arguments, which they admit to be cogent. If, further, mention is made of one heathen power only in 1^{2-17}, that power must be the Chaldean. But the inference of Giesebrecht and Wellhausen is then inevitable, that 1^{5-11} is an earlier prophecy, which is out of place in this context. Such a solution cuts the knot, instead of untying it, but if none of the other solutions commend themselves, it is on it that we are driven back. If the Chaldeans are the subject of $1^{2-4, 12-17}$, then these passages reflect a situation incompatible with that reflected in 1^{5-11}. Naturally, however, this is a last resort, to be accepted only if the ascription of 1^{5-11} to Habakkuk should prove to be untenable.

It is the merit of Budde's theory and the modifications of it, that it permits us to regard 1^{5-11} as an integral part of the prophecy; but it cannot be denied that each form of the theory is open to serious objections. Those of Budde and G. A. Smith labour under the initial difficulty that they postulate a dislocation of the original prophecy. This is not at all a fatal objection. It is very probable that originally Isa. 5^{25-30} stood in connexion with Isa. 9^{8}–10^{4}. Moreover Budde explains that in the present case the dislocation was intentional. After the Chaldeans became the oppressing power and had been overthrown, the prediction of their rise was transferred from its original position after 2^{4} to its present position between 1^{4} and 1^{12}, and thus in the fifth or fourth century the prophecy was turned into an oracle against Babylon. I must confess

that this explanation would seem to me more credible, if I could credit the ancient editor with the ingenious subtlety of the distinguished modern critic. I should prefer to assume that as in Isa. 5^{25-30}, accident rather than design had been at work. In the next place all theories, that regard the Chaldeans as raised up to punish another heathen nation, labour under the difficulty that while the Chaldeans are named, the empire they are to destroy is not. Budde, it is true, supposes that Asshur stood originally in 1^{11} (instead of *w'ʿāshēm*): "Then shall disappear like the wind, and pass away, Asshur who has made his strength his god." The text of 1^{11} is notoriously difficult, but although Budde's suggestion deserves consideration, the objection remains that in our present text, the oppressing empire is not named. This, however, is not a very serious difficulty. On the view of Peiser or Betteridge, the reference to Assyria would be so clear that no need to mention it by name would be felt. And even on Budde's theory there was no such necessity; who the oppressor was, would be understood by the people as well as by the prophet. Similar phenomena are not uncommon. Amos does not name Assyria as the power which is to inflict judgment on Israel, nor does Isaiah in the great passage 5^{26-30}. It is still matter of dispute whether it was the Assyrian army or the combined forces of Syria and Ephraim, whose ravages are depicted in Isa. 1. It is quite uncertain on what nation judgment is predicted in Isa. 33. It is true that the Chaldeans are named in Hab. 1^{6}, but that is natural, for while the oppressing empire was one, there were several powers that might overthrow it, the Medes, the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Chaldeans. It is perhaps not a serious difficulty that the points of

contact between 1^{5-11} and 1^{12-17} suggest that one nation is in the prophet's mind. There was no reason why Habakkuk should idealise the Chaldeans because deliverance came through them; they, as well as the Assyrians "come all of them for violence." The parallel between 1^{11} and 1^{16} would be important if the text were clear enough and the meaning plain enough for anything to be built on it. But even if these preliminary objections are set aside, we still have difficulties attaching to every form of this view.

The most serious objection to Budde's view is that about 615 B.C. the Assyrian empire was too enfeebled for its suzerainty of Judah to have created so oppressive a problem. In less than ten years it would be dead at the heart, it had already begun to die at the extremities. It is to be regretted that Budde does not deal directly with this criticism in his article on *Habakkuk* in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. Less important is the fact, urged by Davidson, that the Chaldeans seem not to have participated in the overthrow of Nineveh by the Medes, for the prophet may have anticipated that they would do so, and as Budde says, "If the Chaldeans took no personal part in the final destruction of Nineveh, they at least were in alliance with the Medes who did, and they contributed all they could to the overthrow of the Assyrian empire." Nowack urges further that the command to write the vision on the tablets suggests that only a brief oracle is intended such as we get in 2^{4}, not such as we have in 1^{5-11}. It is not necessary, however, to regard 1^{5-11} as written on the tablets; Budde, in fact, does not do so. Another objection of Nowack's is more forcible. It is that while $2^{3,4}$ presuppose that there are no definite circumstances on the horizon to suggest a

change of fortune, 1^{5-11} is intelligible only if the Chaldeans had already struck strongly into the main stream of history. It is certainly not easy to harmonise the two points of view. In $2^{3,4}$ the prophet is evidently conscious that appearances are against any relief being speedily given; whereas in 1^{5-11} he points to the Chaldeans as already pursuing their career of conquest. It may, however, serve to mitigate though not to remove, this difficulty, if we remember that this very account of the rise of the Chaldeans is introduced in our present text by a statement which indicates that the prediction of their achievements will seem incredible to the prophet's contemporaries: "He worketh a work in your days, which ye will not believe though it be told you." Lastly, on Budde's theory the prophet was surely singularly impatient. Josiah's reformation took place in 621 B.C. Budde holds that Habakkuk must have written at some point between 621 and the death of Josiah in 609; "so that, halving the difference, we may take 615 or (by preference) a slightly earlier time to be the date of the composition" (*Enc. Bib.* col. 1926). But is it likely that within less than six years of the reformation Habakkuk should have felt the problem of the suffering of the righteous to be so acute? It was hardly reasonable to complain because matters were not righted all at once. Probably Judah was not in a miserable condition at all, but rather, with the relaxing grip of Assyria and Josiah's virtual independence, the years in question were among the happiest in the nation's history.

On the other hand, Budde's view has some advantages. Wellhausen's feeling that the result reached in 2^{4} is too meagre to be worthy of a revelation has considerable force; we should have expected a prediction of judgment

on the oppressor. This is met if we allow 1^{6-11} to follow. There is also something to be said for Budde's contention that the methods of conquest described in 1^{12-17} are those adopted by Assyria rather than by the Chaldeans : " Not all at once, but by numerous separate efforts spread over three centuries, not merely by force of arms, but (as the angling metaphor suggests) by policy and craft, were so many petty principalities and more than one important kingdom swept into the hands of these robbers (cf. Isa. $10^{5-11, 13}$ f.). The Chaldean, on the other hand, far from being the unresting persistent, grasping, amasser of wealth, was simply the smiling heir " (*Enc. Bib.* col. 1923).

Prof. G. A. Smith escapes the worst difficulty of Budde's view, inasmuch as the circumstances, out of which he thinks the prophecy springs, were such as to create its problem. The death of Josiah on the battlefield, the loss of virtual independence, the captivity of Jehoahaz, were all so many inexplicable mysteries on the deeply-rooted belief that character and fortune closely corresponded. The date would then have to lie between 609 and 605 B.C. It is in the earlier rather than in the later part of this period that we should probably have to fix it, before Jehoiakim had had time to display his evil qualities, and before the Reformation had been undone, while men were still stunned by the tragedy of Josiah's death and the disasters that so quickly followed it. But the objections to this view are weighty. Dr. Smith himself suggests one : " But then does the description in chapt. 1^{14-17} suit Egypt so well as it does Assyria ? We can hardly affirm this, until we know more of what Egypt did in those days, but it is very probable " (p. 124). This is very dubious, but, even if it be granted, there is a further difficulty. The prophecy leaves a very strong

impression that the evil of which the prophet complains is one of long standing. He begins with the question: "How long, O Yahweh, shall I cry and Thou wilt not hear?" In 1^{17} he not only asks, "And shall He not spare to slay the nations continually," but also, if with Wellhausen, Nowack and G. A. Smith himself, we accept an emendation of Giesebrecht (*Beiträge* p. 197, n. 1), and read *ha'ōlam* for *ha'al kēn*, "shall he for ever be emptying his net?" This surely points to a condition of things that had been going on for a much longer period than the four years, which is all that this view permits.

Peiser's theory shares with Budde's the advantage that it identifies the oppressor with the long-triumphant power of Assyria, and escapes Budde's most formidable difficulty by transferring the centre of interest from Palestine to Nineveh. The lion was formidable in his own lair (Nah. 2^{11-13}), after his distant dominion had vanished. There can also on this theory be no difficulty raised by 1^{2-4}, the violence of which the prophet complains is not in Judah, but the tyranny practised in Nineveh by the Assyrians. How far the arguments based on the author's familiarity with Assyrian and Babylonian literature are valid, is for cuneiform scholars to say, and this applies also to the suggestion (p. 12), that Habakkuk might well be an Assyrian pseudonym. Friedrich Delitzsch had previously given the same derivation. Naturally much depends on this for a decision on the theory that the prophet wrote in Nineveh, and till specialists have pronounced their opinion, judgment must remain to some extent in suspense. The author, however, does not himself affirm that familiarity with the literature of Assyria and Babylon in cuneiform script

necessarily implies residence in one of these countries. It would be consistent with residence in Jerusalem (p. 10). Nevertheless, if it could be made out, the opinion that he lived in Nineveh would gain in probability. The other argument by which this is substantiated is precarious. It rests on the assumption that the third chapter is by Habakkuk, and this is denied by a large number of scholars. A second assumption is that the original poem ended at verse 16. It was suggested by Wellhausen that the original conclusion was lost and 3^{17-19} substituted for it. He is followed by Nowack (p. 248), while Davidson, though thinking this quite possible, pronounces no definite opinion. It is, however, unfavourably regarded by Budde and rejected by G. A. Smith. Peiser's interpretation of 3^{16} has, of course, independent support in the difficulty of the present text, and the translation given by the LXX. It would be strengthened, however, if 3^{17-19} were a later addition. Peiser differs from Wellhausen in holding that the poem originally closed with verse 16, and that the original ending has not been lost, verses 17–19 being simply an addition not a substitution. If this could be proved, it would be difficult to defend our present text. Even so, it is unsafe to build a theory on an emendation, though supported by the LXX. The reference of "Thine anointed" in 3^{13} to the prophet himself as the rightful monarch is very dubious. The parallelism favours the usual interpretation of the term as the people of Yahweh, a usage which belongs to the period after the destruction of the monarchy. Peiser's view of 1^{5-11} is also very questionable. The passage does not make the impression that it refers to an event now sixteen years old. Rather it is some impending catastrophe that is to be brought

about by the rise of the Chaldeans. And if 1^5 is to be closely connected with what follows, this work which Yahweh is to perform through the Chaldeans is declared to be of an incredible character. It is not at all clear how Peiser interprets 1^5, except that he does not regard it as part of the speech of Yahweh, announcing that the Chaldeans are to be raised up. But it is plain why he has reached the conclusion that 1^{6-11} refers to an event in 625, though he does not explain it. He believes that Habakkuk wrote about 609 B.C. But it would be absurd for any one writing in Nineveh at that time to speak of the Chaldeans as just being raised up. Since Nabopolassar, the Chaldean monarch, had united Babylonians and Chaldeans in 625, and had made good his claims to the throne of Babylon, the Chaldeans had been a standing menace to the Assyrian empire. That the attack on Nineveh in 625 was a failure is inferred from 1^{11}, a passage the meaning of which is so uncertain, that nothing can safely be proved by it. What is strange however, is that the prophet, if he had this attack in mind, and had himself lived through it, should speak of it as if it had been made by the Chaldeans. They may have been in alliance with the Medes, but it was the Medes who actually struck at Nineveh. If we are to think of the prophecy as having been written in Nineveh, it would seem to be much sounder to carry the matter through to a more logical conclusion and date it shortly before 625.

The view taken by Prof. Betteridge is at first sight very attractive. It is not, as with Budde's theory, with the numb grip of a decadent Assyria, but with Assyria in full career of conquest that the prophet is confronted. As he looks from the still uncaptured Jerusalem on a

land laid waste and trampled by a brutal soldiery, its towns and fortresses all taken, with innumerable captives and an enormous spoil, the thought may well have risen within him, Why does Yahweh abandon His people to the heathen? Hitherto it has been generally assumed that the prophecy must be later than 621 B.C., because only after Josiah's reformation could Judah have been described as a righteous people. But why not equally well after Hezekiah's reformation? It is no objection to this that the latter did not take place at the instigation of a law. Even if the prophecy is post-Deuteronomic, there is no need to suppose that *torah* in 1^4 refers to the Deuteronomic Code. The omission of the article and the parallelism with *mishpāt* (judgment) suggests rather that it is to be taken in a more general sense, and we may translate "truth" with Wellhausen and Nowack, or explain it with Betteridge to refer to moral and social order. If the prophecy belongs to Hezekiah's reign, then obviously *torah* no more means "law" here than it does in the contemporary passage Isa. 1^{10}. Moreover, the words "Behold I raise up the Chaldeans" get a fuller significance on this view than on any other. The Chaldeans, who are not to be identified with the Babylonians, really became formidable towards the close of the eighth century B.C. It was not so correct to speak of them a century later as being raised up. For a time the Chaldean Merodach-Baladan achieved remarkable success. He was well-known in Judah, to which he had sent ambassadors, no doubt with a view to combined action against Assyria. At that time the expectation may well have been formed that the Chaldeans were designed to overthrow Assyria. In spite, however, of these real advantages, it is very difficult to accept this

view at any rate in its present form. In the first place Habakkuk is generally regarded as strongly influenced by Isaiah. But we know what Isaiah thought of Judah and its treatment at Assyria's hands in 701. We find it in 22^{1-14} and probably in 1^{2-28}. True, he held firm to his belief in the indestructibility of Zion, which was a corollary to his belief that Yahweh dwelt in it. And he expected Assyria to be destroyed, not for its treatment of Judah, but for its arrogance and its blasphemy against Yahweh. This has its parallel in Hab. 2^{4} and perhaps 1^{11} But the suffering of Judah is no problem to Isaiah; she has richly deserved it all. And he does not look for Assyria to be overthrown by human power. He steadily discourages all foreign alliances for that purpose, and anticipates that Assyria will be broken on the mountains of Yahweh. It may, no doubt, be urged that the difficulty created by the peculiar standpoint of Habakkuk is just as great on any theory, since Jeremiah as much as Isaiah regards the sorrows of Judah as the due reward of her deeds. It would, however, be very remarkable if in 701 Isaiah and a prophet so influenced by him as Habakkuk spoke in such different tones. Might it not be preferable to place it nearer the reformation, when the glow of conscious virtue had not been chilled by its disappointing sequel? Moreover, it is very difficult on historical grounds to believe that the prophecy could have originated in 701. For it was only in the previous year that Sennacherib had driven Merodach-Baladan out of Babylon, and had punished Chaldea with great severity. "Cities to the number of seventy-five in Chaldea proper, with four hundred and twenty neighbouring villages were taken and spoiled" (M'Curdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments* ii. 274).

Is it likely that just then any prophet in Judah should have anticipated that the Chaldeans would overthrow Assyria? It is true that Sennacherib seems to have been recalled from his campaign in Judah by news of a revolt in Babylonia. We may accept this on the basis of Isa. 37^{7}, without committing ourselves to the theory, now favoured by several scholars, that there was a second invasion by Sennacherib some time between 690 and 681. "Hope springs eternal," and Judah may have looked once more to the Chaldeans for deliverance. If so, she was bitterly disappointed, for Sennacherib attacked Bit Yakin in 700, when Merodach-Baladan fled with all the gods of his land to Nagitu in the Fens, an Elamite city, which was captured by Sennacherib, in 694 B.C. It would probably be an improvement on this theory to place the prophecy earlier in Hezekiah's reign, when negotiations with the Chaldeans gave promise of the oppressor's downfall. All through the period from 735, when Ahaz took the fateful step of invoking the aid of Tiglath Pileser to suppress the coalition of Syria and Ephraim, the hand of Assyria pressed heavily on the unhappy land. And, to say nothing of earlier Chaldean success, from the time of Sargon's accession in 721 till 710 Merodach-Baladan held the throne of Babylon. During those years he may well have seemed the destined conqueror of Assyria. Or we might think of the second occasion when he seized Babylon in 703 or 702, when Hezekiah also was throwing off the Assyrian yoke. There is, however, no suggestion in the prophecy that Judah is planning to strike a blow for freedom, and 1^{6-11} does not make the impression that the Chaldeans had only recently received a severe check. It might be urged against a date in Hezekiah's reign that there are several

parallels with Jeremiah. But this is one of those arguments of which we do well to be distrustful. It is generally thought that the description of the Chaldeans in 1^{6-11} exhibits traits borrowed from the Scythians. If it is as late as the reign of Josiah this is probable. Winckler, indeed, supposes that it was an oracle referring to the Scythians. But he takes the same view also of Isa. 5^{25-30}. The description might suit the Chaldeans better in the 8th century than in the time of Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar.

Grave difficulties lie therefore against every form of the view that the Chaldeans are raised up to inflict Yahweh's judgment on another heathen power, though it would be an advantage if we could seek for a solution along this line, inasmuch as the prophecy gains a completeness which it does not possess if we simply eliminate 1^{5-11}. Nor can we shut our eyes to the difficulties that may be urged against the latter view. If the prophet is complaining in $1^{2-4\ 12-17}$ of Chaldean tyranny, we are obliged to bring the prophecy well below 605 B.C., for the prophet speaks out of no little experience of it. But during the whole period from 605 to the fall of Jerusalem in 586, it would be far less fitting to speak of Judah as righteous than in the days of Josiah. Might we then with Giesebrecht place its origin in the exile? This seems at first sight to be unlikely since there is no allusion to the captivity, or to the destruction of city and temple. It is not an insuperable objection. We have a parallel in Isa. 13, though the author of this passage has very little to say of the wrongs inflicted by Babylon, his attention being almost wholly engrossed by the doom in store for it. The possibility of an exilic date has been very little discussed. Budde says the prophecy must be

pre-exilic, but his reason is simply that 1^{2-4} presupposes the existence of the kingdom of Judah. It is not easy to see why. It might just as well refer to the oppressive treatment of the Jews in exile. Baudissin makes a similar objection. There is moreover a positive advantage in an exilic date. The character of prophecy largely changed with the destruction of Jerusalem. Before it the prophets for the most part spoke of judgment on the people of Yahweh, after it they were in the main messengers of consolation to Judah and of judgment on the heathen. Habakkuk belongs to the latter type. This does not prove that he prophesied after the destruction of Jerusalem. But we have already seen that every pre-exilic date proposed is open to serious objections. And we know that after the blow had fallen, Judah developed a consciousness of her own righteousness, at least a relative righteousness over against the heathen. If we thought of the prophecy as written in exile, this might account for the parallels with cuneiform literature pointed out by Peiser. We might then with Lauterburg (*Theol. Z. aus d. Schweiz*, 1896, pp. 24 ff.) read "Persians" for "Chaldeans" in 1^{6} and retain 1^{5-11} as a prediction that judgment will be executed on the Chaldeans by the Persians. But this is very improbable, for it is not easy to see why any one should have changed "Persians" into "Chaldeans," since such a change would have been in the wrong direction. It is more probable, however, that 1^{5-11} should be regarded as an independent prophecy dating from the pre-exilic period, when the Chaldeans were striking into the larger currents of history. For it is difficult to regard it as belonging to the original prophecy, inasmuch as in 2^{3} there are obviously no circumstances in sight to suggest the speedy disappear-

ance of the oppressor, which is, as Wellhausen says, "only a moral postulate." It reminds us of "I the Lord will hasten it in its time" (Isa. 60^{22}).

If then, though with misgivings, we regard 1^{2-4}, 1^{12}–2^{4}, as originating in the exile, a suggestion may be made with a view to determine more narrowly the limits of date. The lower limit is given us by the fact, to which allusion has just been made, that no definite circumstances are on the prophet's horizon, pointing to the overthrow of the Babylonian empire. Accordingly we cannot place it much if any later than 546. On the other hand the absence of allusion to the captivity and the sack of Jerusalem is most easily accounted for if we suppose that the prophet had not lived through them, or was too young at the time to remember them. If he went as a child to Babylonia with Jehoiachin in 597 or was born in Babylonia soon after, as is more likely, he could very well have seen his vision thirty or forty years later. If we date the prophecy about 560–550, we shall not perhaps be far from the mark. We cannot well place it in the post-exilic period, for the problem is in a rudimentary stage, and the author has hardly behind him the discussion of it in Isa. 40–55.

It will not be necessary to add much on the remaining sections of the prophecy. Against the view of Stade and Kuenen that the whole of 2^{9-20} is a post-exilic addition the reader may consult the discussions of Davidson, G. A. Smith, and Driver (Hastings D B), or the detailed defence in Smend's *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte* (1st ed. 1893, pp. 229, 230. It is not repeated in the second edition). Most of the scholars who have written on the subject recently think that part at any rate of the section comes from Habakkuk. Wellhausen thinks the

whole of the woes were uttered against the Chaldeans, but 12–14 have been put together from Mic. 3^{10}, Jer. 51^{58} and Isa. 11^{9}, while 15–17 cannot well come from a prophet who prophesied before the exile since it rests on Jer. 25. On 2^{18-20} he simply says that 19 should precede 18, and that 20 clearly prepares the way for the Theophany in chap. 3. This would involve our treating 20 as a later addition, but no opinion is expressed on the authorship of verses 19, 18. I suspect from the reference to Isa. 41 that Wellhausen regards them as late exilic. Nowack regards 12–14, 18, 20 as later additions, 9–11, 15, 16, 17a as by Habakkuk, 19 is viewed with suspense, though printed as an addition in the translation. Budde thinks 12–14 and 18–20 are later additions. Cornill further suspects 15–17 in its present form. G. A. Smith rejects 18–20, and is doubtful about 12–14. If, however, we date Habakkuk's prophecy in the exile, there is no reason why all the woes in the second chapter should not have come from him, though 12–14 is possibly later. On 20 Budde's judgment may be quoted, " It closes the passage not unfittingly but perhaps was intended at the same time to prepare for the theophany in chap. 3."

The third chapter is held by an increasing number of critics to be post-exilic, though its authorship by Habakkuk is defended by Kirkpatrick and Betteridge, and, with the exception of 17–19, by Peiser. It is not necessary for the present purpose to discuss the question. Stade, Kuenen and Wellhausen have done most to substantiate the view that it is a post-exilic Psalm. The arguments for this conclusion, which is probably correct, may be conveniently seen in Hastings D B or the Encyclopædia Biblica.

[I have felt it unnecessary to state or discuss Rothstein's

very ingenious theories of the first two chapters. I gave an outline of them in my *Guide to Biblical Study*, p. 85. A full statement and criticism may be found in Budde's article in the *Expositor* for May, 1895. So far as I know, they have met with no acceptance.]

APPENDIX B.

Critical Problems of Isaiah 40—66.

FOR the sake of those who are quite unfamiliar with the modern criticism of the Book of Isaiah, it is perhaps desirable to begin by justifying the view that the last twenty-seven chapters of the book cannot be assigned to Isaiah. Our present question is not whether these chapters themselves form a unity, but whether they can be ascribed to the main author of the earlier portion of the book. It is almost conclusive as an answer to this that the standpoint of the prophecy is not that of Isaiah's time but that of the exile. And the prophet does not give any hint that this standpoint is assumed rather than real. There is no prediction of the exile, it is described as having already for some time continued. The frequently repeated statement that an unbelief in the possibility of predictive prophecy underlies the denial of these chapters to Isaiah is therefore both untrue and irrelevant. For we have nothing to do with a prediction of the exile and return as still future, as they were to Isaiah, but a statement that the Jews are in exile and a prediction of their release. The evidence on this point may be first summarized. The prophecy opens with a message of comfort to the people of God and to Jerusalem, on the ground that the latter has received at the hands of Yahweh double punishment

for all her sins. Jacob is saying despairingly that all his ways are hid from Yahweh, 40^{27}. Zion says Yahweh has forgotten me 49^{14}. Jerusalem is drunk with the cup of His fury 51^{17-23}. She is a captive with bands about her neck 52^{2}. She has been forsaken and hated and her land is desolate 60^{15}, 62^{4}, 49^{19}. The holy people have possessed their land but a little while, their adversaries have trodden down the sanctuary 63^{18}. The holy cities are become a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. The holy and beautiful house where their fathers praised Yahweh is burned with fire 64^{10-11}. The oppressing power is Babylon, which has shown the people of God no mercy 47^{6}. Israel is in exile in Babylon 48^{20}, it is a people robbed and spoiled, snared in holes and hid in prison houses, 42^{22}. Such is the state of things described in the last twenty-seven chapters as actually existing. But signs are already present that it is quickly coming to an end. A mighty conqueror has been raised up from the East and the North, $41^{2, 3, 25}$, 46^{11} named Cyrus 44^{28}, 45^{1}. The writer seems to point to his rise as the fulfilment of prophecies formerly given 42^{9}, and in this fulfilment he bids his readers recognise the proof of Yahweh's power to predict the future. He does not predict the raising up of Cyrus as something that still lies in the future. He has already begun his career of conquest, and attracted attention. And if the view is right as it seems to be, that the former prophecies now fulfilled related to his rise, it is impossible to place the prophet's standpoint elsewhere than towards the close of the exile, for he could not appeal to events still in the future as proofs that the prediction of them had been fulfilled. While then the former prophecies have been fulfilled in that Cyrus has begun his career of conquest, this prophet has

new things to declare, that Cyrus will overthrow Babylon and set the captives free, 43 [14], 47, 48 [14], 45 [4, 18]. Following this comes the return of the exiles. They are bidden go forth from Babylon and flee from the Chaldeans 48 [20]. The ransomed of Yahweh are to return and come with singing unto Zion 51 [11]. Cyrus will say that Jerusalem shall be rebuilt and the foundation of the Temple be laid 44 [28]. The cities of Judah shall also be built and the waste places restored 44 [26], 61 [3].

It is quite clear from this survey of the actual statements of these chapters that they cannot be earlier than towards the close of the exile and that some at least are not later than the capture of Babylon by Cyrus in 538. But there are other important arguments proving that they cannot come from Isaiah. There are marked differences in theological ideas. Isaiah is mainly a prophet of judgment, while these chapters contain chiefly messages of comfort and prophecies of restoration. Isaiah's Messianic king disappears and the Servant of Yahweh, the missionary to the heathen and the martyr, a figure unknown to Isaiah, takes his place. The thought of Yahweh's greatness as displayed in creation is developed very fully but is absent from Isaiah. Isaiah's attitude to the Sabbath 1 [13] is not such as we find in 56 [2–6], 58 [13]. The idea of the remnant, while not completely absent, is very subordinate, whereas it holds a leading place in Isaiah's thought. The style of the later chapters is also very different from that of Isaiah, being more diffuse, rhetorical and pathetic, nobly eloquent it is true, but circling rather monotonously around a few great thoughts. And the vocabulary, apart from the common stock of words in which two writers might easily coincide, presents very little that

points to identity of authorship, and much that tells strongly the other way. These arguments which are much strengthened by detailed comparison of the two sections of the book may suffice to prove that these chapters are not from the hand of Isaiah.

The next question is whether Isa. 40–66 forms, apart from slight interpolations, a substantial unity. It was natural that for a long period this assumption should pass unchallenged. Such scholars as Ewald and Bleek had, however, pointed out signs of composite authorship, and at a later period Cheyne opened the way to the newer criticism by his important article on Isaiah in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1881). Kuenen in his Introduction to the Prophets (1889) took up a very advanced position. The prophecy of Restoration he defined as consisting of chapters 40–49, 52^{1-12}, with possibly 52^{13}–53^{12}. In 1891 Cheyne reached the conclusion that the work of the second Isaiah consisted of two parts (*a*) 40–48, (*b*) a broken collection composed of 49^{1}–52^{12}, 52^{13}–53^{12} (a later addition by the author) 54, 55, 56^{9}–57^{21} (beginning with a long passage from an older prophet probably worked up with a deutero-Isaianic fragment by the editor) and 60–62. In other words the Second Isaiah's work consisted of 40–55, 60–62, with part of 56^{9}–57^{21}. The question passed into a new stage with Duhm's commentary in 1892. He attributed 40–55, with the omission of the Servant passages, to the second Isaiah, and 56–66 to a single author whom he called Trito-Isaiah. His results were very widely accepted with the exception of his view of the Servant passages. Cheyne in his *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1895), agreed that the work of the second Isaiah did not extend beyond 55, but he thought that the Servant passages were inserted

by the author and possibly were earlier compositions of his own. He further refused to admit the unity of 56–66. These chapters he regarded as containing ten independent compositions, not necessarily by so many authors, written in the age of Nehemiah, while 63^{7}–64^{12} he assigned to the time of Artaxerxes Ochus. Marti agrees with Duhm both as to the Second and Third Isaiah, except that he considers the Servant passages to be an integral part of the Second Isaiah's work. Since the publication of his *Introduction*, Cheyne has modified his view of 40–55 in two respects. In agreement with Kosters he considers that the Second Isaiah's work does not extend beyond 48, a position to which Kuenen approximated in his *Introduction*. 49–55 he regards as a post-exilic appendix. Further, he now considers the Servant passages to be post-exilic compositions.

The ground on which it is held that the last twenty-seven chapters are not a unity are very cogent, though it is not so clear where the line should be drawn between the work of the Second Isaiah, and that of later supplementers. The case seems clearest against 65, 66, least clear against 60–62. It is not possible to go through the various sections in detail, but since it is now commonly held that 56–66 are not by the Second Isaiah, it will be most convenient to begin by exhibiting the arguments that point to this conclusion. In the first place it would seem that there had been a restoration of exiles already 56^{8}. Some had already been gathered, and it is promised that others shall be gathered to these. This suits no period except after the return under Cyrus. The references to a return as still future in $60^{4,8,9}$, 66^{20} do not conflict with this, for the return under Cyrus, and, much later, that under Ezra were comparatively small. The

reference to all the nations in 66^{20} shows that the author is thinking of the Dispersion. This argument, however, does not prove that 56^{8} is not by the Second Isaiah. He might quite well have returned in 536 and added prophecies to those he had uttered in the exile. Such a view would also be consistent with the fact that the Temple seems from some passages to have been rebuilt. The clearest instances are 65^{11} and 66^{6}, but it is also probable that 56^{5-7}, 60^{7}, 62^{9}, should be similarly interpreted. This brings us down to the year 515. The references to idolatry in 57^{3-14} and in the last two chapters $65^{1-7, 11, 12}$, $66^{3, 4, 17}$, scarcely suit the exile. It was in fact one of the arguments, by which conservative critics defended the Isaianic authorship, that $57^{5, 6}$ could not have been written in Babylon, where there are no torrent-beds or terebinths, but must have been written in Palestine. The rites described are also similar to those familiar in Canaanite worship. On this ground several critics supposed that 57^{3-14} was a pre-exilic passage inserted by the Second Isaiah. But it is far from clear why he should have inserted it, and the tone of the prophecy is not such as would be congenial to the writer of the earlier part of 40–66. It is simpler then to regard it as referring to customs practised after the Return. In this case we can readily understand the conditions to which he refers. A certain number of Jews had been left behind in Judah after the captivities to Babylon and the flight of Johanan and many more into Egypt. This people of the land that was left probably belonged to the most superstitious stratum of Jewish society. It seems to have been further contaminated through connexion with the surrounding heathen population. Further, in Samaria the remnant of

Israelites left after the downfall of the Northern Kingdom had been reinforced by heathen settlers. These facts amply explain the existence of gross heathen practices among the Israelitish and Jewish peoples in Palestine. It is also not unlikely that in 66[1] we have a reference, as Duhm has conjectured, to the Samaritan project of building a Temple. It is quite clear that the prophet, whether the Second Isaiah or a later writer, could not, in view of numerous passages to the contrary, be depreciating the Temple at Jerusalem. He might be attacking the unspiritual worshippers who wished to erect a Temple, assuring them that Yahweh desired no temple from such as they were. But this hardly agrees with the language used by the Second Isaiah, whether in 40–55 or in later chapters, in which much stress is laid on the Temple. The explanation which brings it into relation with the Samaritan Temple meets the conditions fairly well. It must be remembered that Haggai complains of the character of the people and yet urges them to rebuild the Temple. It is further significant that there is a great contrast between the tone of 40–55 and that of much of 56–66. This comes out in various ways. While in the former we have the prophet exulting in near deliverance, in the latter there are references to delay. In the 59th chapter the prophet complains that salvation is far from them (verses 9–11). He gives as the reason for this that the iniquities of the people have effected a separation between themselves and God. It is not that Yahweh's hand is so shortened that He cannot save, but that the people are themselves so steeped in sin. The glowing prophecy of the splendours of Zion in 60 ends with the words, "I the Lord will hasten it in its time." Again stress is laid much more than by the

Second Isaiah on the externals of religion such as the Temple service and keeping of the Sabbath. The description of the social condition of the community agrees better with the view that it consisted no longer of exiles in Babylon, but of a people, who, without being politically independent, yet possessed a large degree of self-government. It is true that this is not decisive because we know so little of the circumstances of the exiles in Babylon. The general affinities are, however, with the state of things reflected in the post-exilic prophets, especially Malachi, and this applies not only to social but also to religious conditions, especially to the division into parties. And although there are close similarities in language and idea between 56–66 and 40–55, the difference in tone and point of view is very marked. The coincidence may readily be explained on the theory of imitation.

On the question whether 56–66 is itself composite, no more need be said than is said on pp. 79, 80. Nor is it necessary to discuss the view that the work of the Second Isaiah ended with 48. The two sections 40–48 and 49–55 are bolted together by the Servant passages. On these see Appendix C.

APPENDIX C.

The Servant of Yahweh.

IT is unnecessary to linger over the passages in which the Servant of Yahweh is unquestionably Israel. But the four passages already mentioned (42^{1-4}, 49^{1-6}, 50^{4-9}, 52^{13}–53^{12}), which may for convenience be called the Servant passages, have for the last twelve years aroused keener discussion than perhaps any other Old Testament problem. The questions at issue are both critical and theological, and touch the authorship of the passages and their interpretation. The question of authorship is to some extent associated with that of interpretation. If the passages are the work of the Second Isaiah, there is a rather strong presumption that he means by the Servant in them what he has meant in other parts of the prophecy that is Israel. On the other hand, the converse of this proposition would not be so probable, for if it were to be determined that in these passages the Servant meant the same as in the rest of Isa. 40–55, identity of authorship could not be inferred from this, inasmuch as two writers might speak of Israel as the Servant. Again, if difference of meaning could be established, identity of author would be improbable. But if difference of author were established, nothing more would follow than that one of

the reasons for accepting identity of interpretation would disappear. Yet each of the four alternatives has its representatives. The usual view has been that we have identity of author and identity of meaning. Sellin, however, has argued for identity of author with difference of meaning. Wellhausen and Smend accept difference of authorship with identity of meaning. Duhm and several other scholars argue for difference of author and difference of meaning. It may be urged that since the Servant passages seem only loosely connected with their context, it is likely that they were not inserted here by the Second Isaiah himself. But it is still less likely that any one else inserted them in an apparently quite unsuitable context, whereas there may have been subtle points of connexion in the author's mind, which do not at all lie on the surface. Some scholars have argued with considerable force that such points of contact may be discovered. We may also leave open the possibility that the Second Isaiah composed the Servant passages at an earlier period, and worked them into the main body of his prophecy, or even that he composed them later and inserted them, though this is improbable.

It is better to attack the problem on the exegetical than the critical side, and from an examination of the passages themselves discover the significance assigned in them to the figure of the Servant. The main question is whether the Servant is an individual or Israel. It will be convenient to discuss the individual interpretation first.

The credit of establishing, to the satisfaction of many recent scholars, that the Servant is to be regarded as an individual, belongs to Duhm. In his commentary on Isaiah published in 1892, he assigns the four Servant

passages to the age of Nehemiah, and accounted for their present position by saying that they were inserted where there happened to be room in the margin or between sections of the prophecy, a wholly frivolous explanation. The Servant was a contemporary of the author of the poems. He was a teacher of the Law, and a leper, despised and persecuted by his countrymen. After his death from leprosy and burial in dishonour, his disciples, of whom the author was one, expected him to rise again and in his exaltation accomplish God's great purpose. Kittel and Sellin revived an earlier view that the Servant in Isa. 52^{13}–53^{12} was Zerubbabel, who was supposed to have been put to death by the Persians for revolt in connexion with a Messianic movement. Sellin's view was combined with a very complicated literary theory as to the composition of the Second Isaiah. He has since withdrawn the identification with Zerubbabel, and now fixes on Jehoiachin as the Servant. Bertholet adopts a collective interpretation for the Servant passages in general, but regards nearly the whole of Isa. 53 as an insertion, written on the fate of Eleazar, a martyr in the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. In the first edition of his *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, Smend modified Duhm's view in two respects. He regarded the Martyr referred to as living and dying before the time of the Second Isaiah, who incorporated the Servant passages in his work, and he thought the Servant was not to be interpreted in the same way in all of them. He adopted the individual interpretation of 50^{4-9}, 52^{13}–53^{12}, but in 42^{1-4}, 49^{1-6} identified the Servant with Israel, since in the latter passage the Servant before his resurrection speaks as if he were still living, which does not suit the individual. He also interpreted the resurrection of the martyr as

metaphorical, the Servant does not rise from the dead, but he lives again in the successors who carry on his work. In his second edition (1899) he has withdrawn this view and identifies the Servant in all four passages with Israel.

The strength of the individual interpretation lies in the fact that the language of some of the passages and especially of 52^{13}–53^{12} seems to point to some definite individual as in the prophet's mind. Probably some will always find it impossible to believe that this language can refer to anything but an individual. It is, however, exposed to very grave objections. In the first place we must reckon with the fact that the Servant passages are at present found in a prophecy in which the Servant of Yahweh is identified with Israel; there is therefore a presumption that in these passages this identification should be maintained. In the next place this identification is actually made in the present text of one of our Servant passages, "Thou art My servant: Israel, in whom I will be glorified" (49^{3}). Duhm has accordingly to strike out the word "Israel," but there is no real justification for this, apart from difficulties that may be felt in the national interpretation. Smend retained the word in his first edition, but, as already mentioned, while he held that in the first two Servant passages the Servant was Israel, he adopted an individual interpretation for the last two. This position, however, is very difficult, the same view should be taken in all four passages. A third difficulty is the idea, at this date, of a resurrection of the Servant, since elsewhere we find the thought of individual resurrection in much later passages. This difficulty is not insuperable. If the Servant was an individual, the impression he made was so great, that

a conviction that death could not hold him, would not have been altogether unnatural. Fourthly, it is very hard to believe that an Old Testament prophet could have spoken of any contemporary in such language as we find in 52^{13}–53^{12}. This is not merely on account of the representation of the Servant as suffering vicariously for those who utter 53^{4-6}, but on account of the world-wide notice attracted by him and the world-wide influence that he exerts. He will startle many nations and kings shall be dumb with astonishment before him. So in 49^{1} the Servant bids the far lands and the nations listen,and in ver. 6 says that Yahweh has given him for a light to the Gentiles, to be His salvation to the ends of the earth. In the first passage 42^{1-4} he is to bring forth judgment to the nations, he is to set judgment in the earth and the far lands wait for his teaching. It is highly improbable that the prophet should have formed so exalted a conception of any contemporary as to have believed that he would rise from his dishonoured grave and undertake so successful a mission to the heathen world. And how are we to suppose that whole nations and their kings were startled by the transformation in the fortunes of a despised and persecuted leper, of whom during his lifetime they would never have heard ? There is nothing to show that the Servant was a king or prince, who might have attracted attention of this kind.

It seems, then, that the objections to an individual interpretation are very cogent. The question therefore arises whether in spite of the features which seem so strongly to point to a person, we should not accept the identification of the Servant in some sense with Israel. This is supported by 49^{3} and the LXX text of 42^{1}. It is held in various forms, the Servant being regarded as the

historical nation, or the righteous kernel of the nation, or the prophetic order, or the ideal Israel. The most obvious explanation is that the historical Israel is meant. The word is thus used in its strict sense, as we have a right to expect, unless we are warned to the contrary, and the Servant thus bears the same significance here as in the rest of 2 Isaiah. This view has been defended above all by Giesebrecht, but also by Budde and Marti, and is accepted among others by Wellhausen, Smend, Cornill, Siegfried and H. P. Smith. In spite of this weighty array of supporters, many scholars regard it as exposed to insuperable objections. In the first place it is said that the description given of the Servant does not correspond to the actual character and career of Israel. The Servant is an innocent sufferer, but the prophets represent Israel as suffering for its own sin, and the Second Isaiah himself does so. It is best to consider this with a second objection. If Israel suffers for the sins of others, these can only be the heathen. Accordingly we must regard the heathen as speaking in the former part of chap. 53, as confessing their misconceptions of the Servant and saying that he has suffered for their sins. It is urged that this is incredible on the lips of the heathen, and if the prophet had meant this he would have said it explicitly. The former of these objections is very precarious, the passage is of a very extraordinary character in any case, and we cannot rule out an interpretation because it expresses something very surprising to us. As to the latter objection, we cannot demand that the prophet should introduce the speakers explicitly. The sudden burst into speech at the beginning of 53 is fine and effective, and similar cases occur elsewhere. Moreover we must not judge what the prophet may

have thought necessary for clearness by what his readers may feel to be necessary. If he identified the Servant with Israel in his own mind, then he would regard it as self-evident that the speakers in the former part of 53 must be the heathen nations. All we could reasonably expect would be that an intimation should be given in the context. And this we have in the immediately preceding verse 52^{15}. The Servant is to startle many nations, and kings are to be dumb with amazement before him. It is therefore not far-fetched to suppose that after this we have an expression of their astonishment. This we get in 53^{1} which may quite well be translated "Who would have believed that which we have heard? but to whom has Yahweh's working been revealed?" The meaning is that they have heard the wonderful news of the Servant's exaltation, and their first thought is, Who could ever have believed that this high destiny was reserved for him? They then go on to excuse their blindness to his true character. He was like a dwarfed and sickly plant with no beauty or promise, like a leper cursed by God. Then they proceed to confess that the curse which they thought rested upon him, was really the punishment for their own sin. In this way we get a perfectly connected line of thought. These deep truths are not strange on the lips of the nations, for it is not the nations in their heathen blindness who are speaking, but the nations who have witnessed the exaltation of the Servant and have come to recognise Yahweh as the true God. The train of thought which leads up to their conclusion is not hard to discover. They have seen Israel enduring unparalleled suffering, and have explained it to be due to its unparalleled sin. But now they find from Israel's exaltation that Israel has been righteous.

How then account for its suffering? If it is not due to its own sin, then may it not be due to theirs? They have gone astray into idolatry, Israel has clung to the true God. But Israel has suffered, while they have gone free. What they have deserved Israel has endured. Its suffering has been vicarious. All this is a perfectly natural explanation of the passage. But if it is the heathen nations that speak in the former part of chap. 53, much of the first objection is removed. This was that the prophets, including the Second Isaiah, regarded Israel as guilty and suffering for its own sin, while the Servant is represented as innocent and suffering for the sins of others. But some of the strongest expressions of the latter thought occur in the former part of chap. 53. If this contains the confession of the heathen, it must be judged as spoken from their point of view. Naturally in their revulsion of feeling, in their recognition of their own sinfulness and the extreme suffering of Israel, they look on Israel as innocent in comparison with themselves, and therefore as suffering for the world's sin, not for its own. Still, this does not entirely remove the difficulty. The author of the Servant passages speaking in his own person, expresses similar ideas about the Servant. It may be he who speaks of him as righteous, says that he had done no violence, neither was deceit in his mouth. In 50^5 the Servant says, "I was not rebellious, neither turned away backward." Yet these expressions are quite compatible with a recognition of sin in the Servant; freedom from violence and deceit is by no means the same thing as sinlessness. Moreover the Second Isaiah's estimate of Israel was more favourable than that of the earlier prophets, though he does speak strongly of Israel's sin. It is also very important to observe that

he considers Israel's punishment to have been excessive : "She hath received at the Lord's hands double for all her sin." If Israel has received double punishment, it is not far from this to the thought that the suffering it has not deserved, has been for the sin of other nations. In comparison with these Israel might be regarded as righteous. It is not of an absolute but of a relative righteousness that the author is thinking. As confirming the interpretation that Israel suffers for the sin of the Gentile nations, it may be pointed out that in the first two Servant passages, the mission of the Servant to the Gentiles is emphasised, so that from the outset a close connexion is affirmed between the Servant and the Gentile world.

A third objection to the identification of the Servant with the historical Israel is that the two are expressly distinguished. This seems at first sight to be conclusive. In 53^{8} the Servant seems to be regarded as smitten for the sin of Israel. But the text should be corrected and we should probably read "for our rebellions he was smitten to death." (See pp. 56, 57, note 34.)

The other passage which is thought to affirm a distinction between Israel in the national sense and the Servant is $49^{5,6}$. The usual view is that here the Servant has, as part of his mission, the function of restoring Israel from exile. There are some general objections to this. Nowhere else is this function assigned to the Servant, or mentioned in the Servant passages. This is very remarkable, whether we regard the passages as written by the Second Isaiah or not. If they were written by the Second Isaiah, it is very strange that he should assign to the Servant what elsewhere he assigns to Yahweh. It is also strange, considering that the

restoration of Israel is a main theme of his prophecy, that it should here be introduced as affording insufficient scope for the Servant's activity. But it is strangest of all that the writer should speak of the Servant as restoring Israel, when he has frequently identified the Servant with Israel, and has in fact just done so in this very passage. What meaning are we to put on the statement that Israel restores Israel from exile? Similarly, if the Servant passages are not by the Second Isaiah, this difficulty still lies against the view that the Servant brings back Israel from exile, unless in 49^3 we quite arbitrarily delete "Israel." Besides, it would be very remarkable that the author should assume, as if it were a well-known function of the Servant, that he should raise up the tribes of Jacob, although this is nowhere else mentioned, and announce as a still further achievement the mission to the Gentiles which has already been emphasised in the first Servant passage. Probably, however, the usual view of $49^{5,6}$ is incorrect, (see pp. 46, 47, note 12,) and no distinction between the Servant and Israel can be based on this passage.

Fourthly, we have the fact, already mentioned, that the language in some of the passages is so personal in its character, as to suggest very strongly that an individual and not the nation is in the prophet's mind. But we must not forget that the personification of nations or other collective bodies went very much further in Hebrew than would be permissible in English, and that this fact is often disguised from English readers of the Bible, since the expression has been toned down into harmony with English idiom.* Thus in Josh. 9^7 the R.V. translates

* See a good note in Gray's *Numbers*, on The Personification of Nations, pp. 265, 266.

"And the men of Israel said unto the Hivites, Peradventure ye dwell among us," but the literal translation is "And the man of Israel said unto the Hivite, Peradventure thou art dwelling in my midst." It is generally admitted that in several of the Psalms the first person singular stands for the nation, though the range of this is greatly disputed. In Lamentations also the nation speaks in the first person singular. A very striking parallel to the description of the Servant is found in Psa. 129^{1-3}, where we read "Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth up," and again "The plowers plowed upon my back, they made long their furrows." These expressions in themselves suggest that an individual sufferer is speaking, but the passage definitely puts the words in Israel's mouth. We need not therefore feel obliged by the very marked character of the language to see in the Servant an individual. The nation is personified, though the personification is certainly remarkable.

The objections to the view that the Servant is the Israelitish nation, which has suffered death in the exile and is to experience a glorious resurrection in the restoration, after which it will instruct the heathen in the true religion, seem therefore to be inconclusive. It has the great advantage that the Servant passages are thus brought into line with the general conception formed by the Second Isaiah of Israel's restoration and mission to the Gentiles. This relationship to the heathen along with the assertion that Israel has received a double punishment for her sin, supply the basis for the doctrine that Israel has suffered on account of the sins of the heathen. It is better to understand by the Servant the actual historical Israel than any section of Israel, such as the righteous kernel of the nation. The speakers in

the former part of 53 would in that case be the rest of Israel. But as they had also suffered very heavily for their sin they would hardly be inclined to see in the spiritual Israel within Israel the vicarious sufferer for their sin. Nor do the individualizing features of the prophecy suit a number of persons in the nation so well as they suit the whole nation.

Nor need we with Cheyne, Skinner and others interpret the Servant to be the ideal as distinguished from the historical Israel. There are certain advantages in this view. The language used is not too elevated, and there is not the difficulty that while Israel is regarded as sinful the Servant is righteous, since on this view the Servant is not the actual Israel. This interpretation helps to account for the features transferred to it from the history of Israel, or of the righteous remnant or even of such individuals as Jeremiah and the other prophets. These were so many realisations in fact of what existed in the ideal. But this view labours under serious difficulties. First there is the unquestionable fact that the Second Isaiah speaks of the Servant in language inapplicable to the ideal Israel. If then he is the author of the Servant passages, he uses the word in incompatible senses. Further it is not quite natural for the Israelites to regard the ideal Israel as suffering for their sins. The thought might perhaps be of the persecutions endured by those in whom the ideal Israel had found its partial realisation, true prophets and other pious Israelites. And where the more spiritual religion came in conflict with the traditional, the adherents of the latter would regard the sufferings which the former entailed as manifest tokens of Divine displeasure, and thus we might say that the ideal Israel had to endure the misjudgment

of the Israelites, who attributed its afflictions in its representatives to their adherence to what was false and sinful. Thus Jeremiah's doctrine of the overthrow of the nation and the destruction of the Temple contradicted an intense religious feeling that existed in the nation. This was a case in which the ideal Israel may be said to have come into collision with the actual and to have suffered at its hands. Yet while it is on these lines that an explanation would have to be sought, if there were no alternative to taking the Servant as the ideal Israel, the thought that the ideal Israel suffers for the sins of the Israelites is extremely artificial. Moreover, if we distinguish between the Servant and the actual Israel, it is not easy to avoid the conclusion that the Servant as a part of his mission has to restore Israel from Babylon. But what are we to make of the thought that the ideal Israel restores the actual Israel from exile? The best answer would perhaps be that the work assigned to Israel in the Divine plan, required its restoration, and since the actual was restored for the sake of the ideal, the work of restoration may be ascribed to the Servant. But there is plainly a difference between that for which a thing is done and that by which it is done, and the explanation reminds one too forcibly of some very risky New Testament exegesis. Lastly, we are under the disadvantage that we must omit the exile from the sufferings of the Servant. By so doing we cut the passages away from the most important fact in the contemporary historical situation, and thus fail to find in them the author's solution of the problem that pressed most heavily on his contemporaries. This is all the more arbitrary, since the author has said at the outset that Jerusalem has suffered a double punishment for

all her sin. This is explained, if part of the punishment has been vicarious. But if we identify the Servant with the ideal Israel we reach the strange result that while the actual Israel has received in the exile twice as much punishment as it deserved, its sins are nevertheless atoned for by the sufferings of the ideal Israel, in which the exile is not included. It is not probable that the Israelites who had suffered the penalty of exile would utter the thought that the ideal Israel had borne their sins.

For these reasons we must reject the identification of the Servant with the ideal Israel, and accept the view that the Servant is throughout the actual Israel, which died in the exile and is to rise again in the restoration. Nevertheless there is an element of truth which must be recognised in the view that the Servant is the ideal Israel. The nation is regarded in the light of its purpose in the mind of God. The Servant is not an ideal distinct from the nation, but the nation regarded from an ideal point of view. This accounts for all the phenomena, and introduces consistency into the representation more successfully than any of the rival interpretations, inasmuch as differences are due not to any change in the identity of the Servant, but simply to change in the aspect under which he is regarded.

INDEX.

Ahaz, 166
Alexander the Great, 121
Allegory, 119
Amos, 7, 23, 157
Angels, 106, 119, 122—124
Anger of God, 1, 29—31, 85, 95, 105
Antiochus Epiphanes, 80, 123, 182
Apocalyptic 108, 118—125
Apostates, 124, 125
Artaxerxes Ochus, 80, 121, 176
Assurbanipal, 154
Assyria, 3, 8—11, 28, 153—155, 157—161, 163—166
Babylon, 3, 4, 12, 17, 28, 34, 59, 156, 157, 163, 166, 167, 169, 173, 174, 177, 179
Baethgen, 68, 114
Baudissin, 168
Bertholet, 54, 182
Betteridge, 155, 157, 163, 164, 170
Bickell, 68
Bit Yakin, 166
Bleek, 175
Book of Life, 123
Budde, 6, 9, 47, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 152—163, 167, 170, 171, 185
Buhl, 46, 58, 113
Canon, 134
Carchemish, 3
Chaldeans, 4, 8, 9, 151—160, 163—168, 170
Cheyne, 16, 48, 49, 51, 53—56, 57—59, 67—69, 80, 116, 121, 126, 175, 176
Christ, 42, 65, 66, 145—150
Christianity, 64, 65, 145—150
Cornill, 14, 153, 170, 185
Covenant, 15, 16
Cross, 148, 149
Cyrus, 34, 35, 39, 73, 173, 174, 176
Daniel, 106, 120, 123—125, 144
Davidson, 126, 153, 155, 158, 162, 169
Day of Yahweh, 7, 120
Death, 110—112, 115—117, 122, 133, 137—141
Decalogue, 21
Delitzsch Fried., 161
Deuteronomy, 2, 124, 164
Dillmann, 47, 48
Driver, 113, 116, 153, 155, 169
Duhm, 14, 16, 46—49, 51—54, 56, 58, 59, 67—69, 71, 79, 109, 112—116, 121, 175, 176, 181—183
Ecclesiastes, 125—136, 148
Egypt, 3, 4, 18, 19, 37, 153, 157, 160, 176
Eleazar, 182
Election of Israel, 38, 39, 61, 65

Eliphaz, 88
Elihu, 83, 88
Elohim, 77, 106
Encyclopædia Biblica, 16, 153, 158—160, 170
Encyclopædia Britannica, 175
Enoch, 110
Ephraim, 166
Ethiopia, 37
Ewald, 45, 175
Exile, 4, 17—22, 31, 34, 50, 59—62, 64, 172—174, 190, 192, 193
Ezekiel, 18, 22—33, 36, 60, 63
Ezra, 79, 176
Fellowship with God, 13—15, 23, 32, 84, 95, 100, 112, 117, 131, 144, 150
Gedaliah, 19
Gentiles, 37, 38, 59, 63, 64, 188, 189
Giesebrecht, 15, 16, 44—49, 51—53, 57—59, 151, 152, 156, 161, 167, 185
Gog, 31
Graetz, 49
Gray, 189
Habakkuk, 4—11, 151—171
Haggai, 74, 178
Halévy, 69
Hananiah, 17
Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, 125, 126, 169, 170
Heathen, 4, 10, 11, 38—41, 42—44, 55, 59—65, 67, 72, 106, 177, 178, 184—190
Hebrews[1], 54
Hebrews, Epistle to, 9, 16
Herodotus, 3
Hezekiah, 155, 164, 166
Hitzig, 14, 68, 115
Hosea, 23
Host of the height, 106, 122
Immortality, 95, 102, 103, 108, 110, 112, 116, 117, 133, 134, 139, 144, 146
Incarnation, 66
Individualism, 15, 24—27
Isaiah, 1, 11, 23, 44, 165, 172
Isaiah, chs., 24—27, 121—123
Isaiah, chs., 40—66, 172—179
Isaiah, chs., 40—55, *see* Second Isaiah
Isaiah, chs., 56—66, 79—82, 175—179
Ishmael, 19
Israel, 15, 28—32, 36—39
See Servant of Yahweh
Jehoahaz, 3, 160
Jehoiachin, 3, 22, 169, 182
Jehoiakim, 3, 160
Jeremiah, 4, 10, 11—16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 27, 63, 117, 165, 167, 191, 192
Jerusalem, 4, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 30, 37, 75, 81, 82, 162, 163, 168, 169, 172—174, 192
Job, 77, 78, 83—103
Joel, 120, 121
Johanan, 177
Jonah, 45, 49, 63, 117
Joshua, 75, 76
Josiah, 2, 3, 9, 19, 155, 159, 160, 164, 167
Judah, 9, 10, 11, 22, 75, 81, 120, 121, 151, 153—155, 164—168
Judaism, 63, 64, 135
Kings, Book of, 22
Kirkpatrick, 170
Kittel, 75, 182
Klostermann, 109
Knobel, 56

Kosters, 176
Kuenen, 169, 170 175, 176
Lagarde, 113
Lamentations, 190
Laue, 126
Lauterburg, 168
Leper, 54, 182, 184, 186
Locusts, 120
Maccabean Age, 118
Magdolos, 3
Malachi, 78, 79, 80, 179
Manasseh, 2, 22, 24, 154, 155
Manetho, 54
Marti, 16, 44, 46, 48, 49, 51—56, 58, 59, 69, 79, 121, 176, 185
Martyrs, 124, 182
M'Curdy, 165
Medes, 155, 157, 158, 163
Megiddo, 3
Merodach Baladan, 164—166
Messianic Hope, 74, 75, 182
Messianic King, 174
Micah, 23
Michael, 123, 124
Migdal, 3
Mission to the heathen, 38—41, 44—47, 49, 59—65, 67, 174, 184—190
Monotheism, 37
Moore, 53
Mysteries, 115
Nabopolassar, 163, 167
Nagitu in the Fens, 166
Nahum, 7, 10
Nebuchadnezzar, 3, 19, 167
Nehemiah, 79, 80, 176, 182
New Covenant, 15, 16, 117
Nineveh, 7, 154, 155, 158, 161—163
Nowack, 153, 158, 161, 162, 164, 170
Origin of Man, 137, 138
Pain, 137, 140—144
Paul, 9, 37
Peiser, 9, 153—155, 157, 161—163, 168, 170
Personification of Nations, 189, 190
Pharaoh Necho, 3
Princes, Angel, 106, 123, 124
Psalms, 104—117, 118, 190
Psalm, The Twenty-second, 65—72
Psalm, The Thirty-seventh, 107, 108
Psalm, The Forty-ninth, 108—110
Psalm, The Seventy-third, 110—117
Queen of Heaven, 18, 19
Reformation, 2, 5, 9, 10, 19, 160, 164, 165
Remnant, 174
Restoration, 20, 21, 22, 31, 36—39, 46—48, 60, 61, 73, 174, 176, 188—190, 192, 193
Resurrection, 121—125, 144, 182—184
Revelation, 33, 134—136
Rothstein, 170, 171
Sabbath, 174
Samaria, 29, 30, 177
Sargon, 166
Satan, 75—78, 84—86, 101
Scepticism, 78, 79
Schmidt, 16
Scythians, 31, 167
Seba, 37
Second Isaiah, 11, 34, 35—65, 73, 80, 117, 172—179
Sellin, 75—78, 181, 182

Sennacherib, 2, 155, 165, 166
Servant of Yahweh, 35—72, 103, 117, 144, 174, 180—193
Sheol, 94—96, 103, 108—110, 111, 124, 133, 134
Shiloh, 12
Siegfried, 125, 126, 185
Sin, 137, 138
Skinner, 46, 53, 54, 56, 121
Smend, 15, 16, 116, 169, 181—183, 185
Smith G. A., 153, 156, 160—162, 169, 170
Smith H. P., 3, 126, 185
Smith, Robertson, 80
Sodom, 29
Solidarity, 21, 24
Solomon, 79, 125, 129
Sons of God, 77
Spies, 130
Stade, 169, 170
Suffering—
Due to sin, 1, 12, 30, 35, 36, 75, 85, 87, 104, 120, 121
Attributed to Yahweh's weakness, 18
Attributed to Yahweh's forgetfulness, 18, 105
Attributed to loyalty to Yahweh, 18, 19, 105
Due to sin of ancestors, 21, 22, 105
Due only to sin of sufferer, 24
Suffering—
Vicarious, 43, 62, 64, 65, 67, 103, 143—146, 184, 187, 188, 191
Martyrdom 61, 62
Regenerative, 62, 143
Test of piety, 84, 85, 101, 102, 143
Syria, 166
Temple, 4, 11, 12, 19, 30, 74, 79, 120, 173, 174, 177—179, 192
Temple, Samaritan, 178
Thrupp, 71
Tiglath Pileser, 166
Trinity, 147
Trito-Isaiah, 175, 176
Universalism, 37
Valley of Dry Bones, 19—21
Vicarious Punishment, 24
Vicarious Reward, 24
Vision of God, 100, 101
Wellhausen, 39, 70, 71, 109, 113, 115, 116, 151—154, 156, 159, 161, 162, 164, 169, 170, 181, 185
Winckler, 167
Word, 20, 35
Zechariah, 74—78, 120
Zedekiah, 3, 17
Zephaniah, 120
Zerubbabel, 74, 75, 182
Zion, 11, 36, 37, 73, 81, 82, 165, 173, 174, 178

By the Same Author.

"His temper and his matter taken together make him one of the few men that all preachers *ought* to read."—*Christian World.*

A GUIDE TO BIBLICAL STUDY. Hodder and Stoughton. Second edition. 1897. Price 3s. 6d.

"Mr. Peake has earned a right to offer his guidance to younger scholars, and the wisdom and knowledge exhibited in this volume are self-authenticating. The digest of Paulinism is singularly lucid, concatenated, and masterly; a better it would be impossible to point to anywhere. The bibliography is not intended to be exhaustive, but is adapted to the actual wants of the student."—*Expositor.*

"Professor Peake has been most circumspect. We knew he was accomplished. The book will certainly push the scientific study of the Bible one step forward. And it is so capably, carefully written that it will be a landmark in the future."—*Expository Times.*

"Mr. Peake gives a digest of Paulinism which, however we may differ from him on one or two matters of interpretation, can only be characterised as consummately able. The familiarity which he shows with the subject, revealed in the well-digested statements he makes, and the lucidity and consistency with which he constructs the theology of Paul and exhibits it as an organic whole, must win the admiration of every reader and prompt the wish that the same hand would elaborate that chapter into a volume."—Dr. Marcus Dods in *The British Weekly.*

"He has one of the finest expositions of Paul's conception of the work of Christ for our salvation, one of the finest and most convincing we have ever read, and it is all compressed into a page or two . . . . The Bible student who has this book, and an average amount of brains, is far better equipped than hundreds who have sat under professors until grey hairs were here and there upon them."—*Methodist Times.*

By the Same Author.

"We recommend the book to all students in our Universities and Theological Colleges, and to all who wish to know the best and most recent sources of information concerning the Bible."—*Church Bells.*

HEBREWS in THE CENTURY BIBLE. T. C. & E. C. Jack. Price 2s. 6d. net.

"No more competent, authoritative, and illuminating commentaries can be desired than such as are here given us by Professor Peake on Hebrews, or by Mr. Vernon Bartlet on Acts. They are almost certain to supersede in public favour the other New Testament expositions which are available for the English reader."—*British Weekly.*

"This latest contribution to *The Century Bible* is an exquisite piece of work, possessing a value out of all proportion to its size."—*Baptist Magazine.*

"The Editor's remarks on the teaching of the Epistle appeal to us most forcibly. They are characterised by remarkable insight and picturesque presentation."—*New Age.*

"Hebrews is a difficult book to deal with, but Prof. Peake has grappled with it boldly, and written an introduction and a commentary, which are models of sure-footed scholarship and perspicuous explanation."—*Literary World.*

"Mr. Peake has given us in short compass an admirable handling of the difficult questions which are involved in the study of the Epistle to the Hebrews . . . . The notes on the text are just what is wanted."—*Record.*

"The introduction is written in masterly style, the style of one who knows the authorities and at the same time has held it necessary to form conclusions of his own."—*Methodist Times.*

"Most helpful and invaluable notes, which for conciseness, thoroughness, reverent treatment, and scrupulous fairness, cannot be excelled."—*Freemason.*

"Prof. Peake's introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews is a most valuable and scholarly piece of work; giving evidence of much original research, extensive reading and great independence of mind."—*Aberdeen Journal.*

By the Same Author.

JOB in THE CENTURY BIBLE. T. C. & E. C. Jack. Price 2s. 6d. net. (In preparation).

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS in THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT. Vol. III. Hodder and Stoughton. Price 28s.

"The Editor reveals his discernment in entrusting such a book to one whose spiritual insight is not less remarkable than his ripe and accurate scholarship . . . . Professor Peake, never satisfied with a mere grammar and dictionary exegesis of the words after the example of Ellicott's and Vaughan's Commentaries, dives into the difficulties of the thought, and wrestles with the obscurities that too often beset the Apostle's ideas. This he does in a style conspicuous for its lucidity and intellectual honesty. Whether St. Paul is always clear or not, Professor Peake never leaves us in doubt as to what he conceives the Apostle to have meant, and always supports his judgment with a careful statement of reasons.—*Principal W. F. Adeney.*

"After Ephesians, naturally, we turn to Colossians to find, as might be expected, that Professor A. S. Peake has also done justice to a great task . . . . . Professor Peake's exposition of the text of the Epistle is careful and complete, and when one samples it at important points it does not disappoint one's expectations."—*Critical Review.*

"Of the work of Professor Peake on the Colossians there is nothing but good to be written. The notes are compact, useful, and not seldom very happily expressed."—*Prof. A. S. Geden.*

FLETCHER AND SON, LTD., PRINTERS, NORWICH.

Denver Seminary Library
Washington DC Extension
1st Bapt Church Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414